



# OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1920-1921

J. W. DUNN (English) University of Wisconsin

HENRY C. CREW (Physics) New Southern University

W. F. FULTON (Mathematics) Massachusetts Institute of Technology

W. T. SEDGWICK (Latin) University of Cincinnati

## For the term ending June 30, 1921

P. CHAMBERLAIN (History) University of Pennsylvania

H. FINE (Mathematics) University of California

A. GRAY (Chemistry) Columbia College

W. H. HARRIS (Classics) Harvard College

JOHN H. HARRIS (Zoology) University of Michigan

G. H. HARRIS (Zoology) Washington, D. C.

A. H. HARRIS (Zoology) University of Illinois

T. H. HARRIS (Zoology) University of Texas

H. HARRIS (Zoology) Harvard University

W. HARRIS (Zoology) Vassar College

## For the term ending June 30, 1922

P. S. DUNN (Latin) University of Oregon

W. F. FULTON (Mathematics) Smith College

IRVING HARRIS (Zoology) Lafayette University

M. W. HARRIS (Mathematics) University of California

A. HARRIS (Zoology) Cornell University

MAX MILLER (Physics) University of Wisconsin

A. HARRIS (Zoology) Harvard University

R. HARRIS (Zoology) State University of Iowa

G. H. HARRIS (Zoology) University of Missouri

C. H. HARRIS (Zoology) Yale University

## For the term ending June 30, 1923

CHARLES COULTER (Zoology) Fairleigh University

JOHN DUNN (Philosophy) Columbia University

THOMAS FRANK (Latin) Johns Hopkins University

EDWARD EVERTS (Classics) Ohio College

W. F. FULTON (Mathematics) Ohio State University

JOHN A. MILLER (Latin) Stambridge College

WALTER MILLER (Greek) University of Miami

W. A. MILLER (Romance Languages) University of Chicago

E. B. PRATT (Philosophy) Wiscumb College

S. S. SCOTT (Latin) University of Wisconsin

## Ex-officio (until year ended)

FRANK TRACY (Philosophy) Cornell University

J. M. TRACY (Zoology) University of Illinois

A. D. LUDGROVE (Philosophy) Johns Hopkins University

EDWARD COULTER (Classics) University of Wisconsin

E. R. ADAMS (Political Science) University of Wisconsin

VOLUME VIII

MAY, 1922

NUMBER 5

# BULLETIN

OF

## THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS.

### REPORT ON UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

PUBLISHED BY  
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS  
225 CHURCH STREET, EASTON, PA.

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 222 CHARLES RIVER ROAD  
CAMBRIDGE  
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

(279)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

General Announcements	PAGE
Committee A, Academic Freedom and Tenure.....	3
Committee on the Bulletin .....	3
Committee P, Pensions and Insurance.....	3
American Council on Education.....	4
American University Union in Europe.....	5
National Conference Committee on Standards.....	6
Institute of International Education.....	6
American Association of Collegiate Registrars .....	8
U. S. Bureau of Education.....	9
Recent Educational Discussion	
Educational Determinism, <i>Bagley</i> .....	10
Tests before College Entrance, <i>Johnston</i> .....	14
Child Labor and Mental Age, <i>Fuller</i> .....	15
"Getting By," <i>Preston</i> .....	18
Tests for Prospective Freshmen, <i>Scott</i> .....	20
Intellectual Interest of Undergraduates, <i>Tatlock</i> .....	21
Sectioning on Basis of Ability, <i>Seashore</i> .....	24
Humanities and the Trend of Education, <i>Laing</i> .....	26
The Student and the Scholar, <i>Michaud</i> .....	30
Early Training of Scientists.....	31
Professors, Politeness First.....	33
Local and Chapter Notes	
California: Institute of Technology.....	34
Clark: Reorganization.....	34
Free Speech Controversy.....	35
Dartmouth: The "Fundamentalist" Movement.....	40
Harvard: General Examinations.....	41
Massachusetts: Legislative Commission.....	43
Minnesota: Financial Suggestions.....	43
Purdue: Students of Exceptional Ability.....	44
Officers of Chapters.....	45
Report on the University of Missouri.....	46
Membership	
Members Elected.....	58
Nominations for Membership.....	59
Membership Corrections.....	62



## GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

**COMMITTEE A, ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE.**—The Nevada Chapter of the A. A. U. P. desires to correct the information furnished Committee A, which appears in the February issue of the Bulletin (page 49), by the following statement which represents the situation more adequately:

The faculty of the University of Nevada have discussed the advisability of an advisory committee to the President, but after hearing the plans of the President for consultation on all matters of university policy with faculty members directly concerned, they think such a committee unnecessary, and have therefore abandoned the idea by regular vote.

On page 49 of the February Bulletin reference is made to the Local Branch of the "University of New York." This should be "College of the City of New York."

The Secretary of the Smith College Chapter writes:

My attention has just been drawn to a slight error in the report of Committee A in the February Bulletin (page 39). The report says in regard to Smith College that "all appointments and promotions come before a Committee consisting of," etc. Appointments do not come before that Committee; the President himself takes the recommendations of the departments to the Trustees.

**COMMITTEE ON THE BULLETIN.**—Chairman, Edwin R. A. Seligman, Columbia University; John Dewey, Columbia University; J. H. Hollander, Johns Hopkins University; A. O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins University; F. R. Moulton, University of Chicago; A. H. Thorndike, Columbia University; H. W. Tyler, Mass. Inst. of Tech.; C. H. Van Tyne, University of Michigan.

**COMMITTEE P, PENSIONS AND INSURANCE.**—Members of the new and smaller committee on pensions and insurance are as follows:

Chairman, W. W. Cook (Law), Yale University; S. S. Huebner, (Finance), Pennsylvania; E. W. Kemmerer (Economics), Princeton; W. F. Willcox (Economics), Cornell.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION.—The fifth annual meeting was held May 5th at Washington, D. C. Numerous committee reports were presented and there was considerable discussion of the Director's proposed plan for establishing a division of university and college personnel, a proposal which has grown out of the action of this Association at the Pittsburgh meeting last December. The plan as worked out by the Director implies at present the formation of a relatively complete card index of professors and instructors in the two hundred colleges of the Council's accepted list and in certain other colleges connected with the Council, the total number of persons being roughly estimated at about 25,000. Registration data will be obtained, so far as practicable, through the college offices, with annual revision. There will be no fee to the registrant in view of the importance of including everybody, and the cards will be open to the inspection of administrative officers of institutions in the Council without charge. These institutions number at present one hundred and forty-five. Whether a charge would be made to administrative officers of other colleges for service, or whether the opportunity would merely serve as an inducement for membership in the Council, remains for the present an open question.

It is also as yet uncertain in what manner names of appointees would be brought to the attention of college officers at a distance from Washington, or whether any plan would be developed for reporting vacancies to persons desiring them. The information on file would be quite objective in character, without letters of recommendation, etc., and registration would not imply any responsibility whatever for securing appointments. Some of these details will presumably be worked out more fully before the new plan is actually inaugurated by the Council. An appropriation of \$5000 has been made for the current year, but it is also expected that subventions will be sought from some of the educational foundations. The interest manifested by appointment officers present leaves little doubt that in some form or other the plan for a division of university and college personnel will be realized. It seems probable also that a co-operative arrangement will be made with the

National Research Council in connection with a plan already inaugurated by it for a card index of research men.

Volume III, No. 2 of the Educational Record contains a revised list of accredited higher institutions with a statement of criteria of the various accrediting bodies.

The Council has published an announcement of scholarships offered American students in France.

Twenty-two colleges and universities, including Cornell, Syracuse and Wisconsin, have recently become institutional members.

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY UNION IN EUROPE.—The Annual Report of the Director of the Continental Division, dated April 22, contains much interesting information. The concluding paragraphs are as follows:

"American university and college men do not lean towards undue enthusiasm regarding what is offered them academically. In spite of this critical bent, our alert and eager students here are practically at one in maintaining that they have variously and richly profited by what has been offered them culturally in France, and can put their finger upon what they have gained abroad which is distinct and different from what they would have gained at home. They are keenly sensitive also to the subtler stimulating or mellowing foreign influences which are none the less valuable because imponderable, intangible, and elusive of precise statement or definition. The general student temper we can register pretty faithfully, and it is a pleasure to state that it is what we have just described it to be.

"The members of our staff would once more express the feeling expressed in its last report—that, in successfully encouraging students to come here for study, they are serving the interests of their own country, and perhaps of France as well, and that they take a solid satisfaction in their work.

"Finally, we glance back at the statistics given above: 1348 students in France, coming from 174 American institutions and 46 states of the Union and attending 49 French institutions.

"In view of these figures and of efforts made here to increase the number and further the purposes of students in France, the Union believes its work will strongly and promptly commend itself to scholars who value the influence of Latin culture, and to Americans

who believe that America now needs badly, and will increasingly need, horizons wider than national ones."

It is requested that institutions which have not already published articles concerning the Union and its work will take early opportunity to do so. The addresses of the Continental and British divisions of the Union are, respectively: I, rue de Fleurus, Paris (Vle); 50, Russell Square, London, W. C. I., and the officers are glad to be of service to American professors and students visiting Europe or seeking information by correspondence.

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS held its fifteenth conference at New York, March 18th, and adopted the following resolution:

Whereas this Committee is an associate member of the American Council on Education, it expresses to the Executive Committee of the Council its willingness to serve as the Council's Committee on Standards, and that it would be happy to have associated with it, in its discharge of these duties, any other individuals appointed by the Council.

On the question of honorary Master's Degrees the following resolution was adopted:

Inasmuch as the customary Masters' Degrees in the several fields are being gradually and wisely restricted to use as degrees in course, and since colleges and universities desire from time to time to grant honorary recognition of the Master's grade, it seems desirable to create a general honorary degree of this grade.

On the question of College Accounting it was voted to recommend:

The National Conference Committee on Standards recommends to the regional and other representative associations of universities and colleges and of their business officers, a study of institutional costs and accounting that may result in the preparation of standard systems that may be recommended to universities and colleges in general.

It was voted to request the Carnegie Foundation to appoint a commission to investigate and to report on the subject of the relation of intercollegiate athletics to education.

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION.—*Exchange and Visiting Professors.* "The system of making grants to professors on leave



of absence has been continued by the Institute. Briefly, the practice is to make a grant of traveling expenses to an American professor on leave of absence who has been invited to lecture in a foreign university to cover the cost of travel from the institution in which he teaches to the institution to which he has been invited, and return. The Institute made grants to twelve professors during the past year... Each professor who receives a grant makes a brief report of his experience and observations to the Institute. So illuminating were some of the reports made this past year that the Administrative Board of the Institute requested the Director to make excerpts from the reports and issue them in the form of a bulletin for the information of those engaged in higher education. The Institute has also been active in arranging for the tours of visiting professors from foreign countries.

#### *Foreign Students in the United States*

"There are thousands of foreign students registered in the institutions of higher learning in the United States and the number is constantly increasing. There can be hardly any question that the United States has supplanted Germany as the rendezvous of foreign students, but there is a serious question whether the universities of the United States generally have undertaken anything like the measures used in Germany before the War to secure the happy orientation of the foreign students...

"Generally speaking it were better if only graduate and technical students came from abroad to our institutions of higher learning but since hundreds of undergraduates do come, it is a pressing duty of those institutions which they enter in large numbers to make adequate provision for the supervision of other aspects of their college life than the intellectual...

"There are thousands of destitute Russian students scattered all over Europe and there are about three hundred of them in the institutions of higher education in the United States. The Director of the Institute recently appealed to a large number of our universities for a grant of tuition fellowships for Russian students with quite gratifying results. These fellowships with some that have been obtained in other ways have enabled fifty of these Russian students to continue their studies... But it is obvious how much remains to be done.



"Considerable hardship has been experienced by some foreign students during the past year because of the new immigration law. That law contains no specific provision regarding foreign students, and the attention of the Director of the Institute was early drawn to the fact that some foreign students were detained at Ellis Island for deportation because the quota from their countries had been exceeded... An understanding has been reached whereby a foreign student complying in all other respects with the immigration law will be admitted until the present law expires on July 1, even though the quota of the country from which the student comes has been exceeded. Such a student is required, however, to give a bond in the penalty of \$500 that he will leave the country within a year...

"In addition to the syllabi published for the International Relations Clubs the Institute issued during the past year its most practical and helpful booklet, 'A Guide Book for Foreign Students in the United States.' The success of this little volume is due to the care exercised in discovering from foreign students in the United States the facts that they would like to have known before they came to this country. Any foreigner can find out about the curriculum of the university in which he wants to study by reading its catalogue, but the catalogue will not tell him how far the university is from the seaboard and the railroad fare to it, the probable cost of living at it, the evaluation of his degree, the American method of obtaining a bachelor's degree by accumulating 'points,' the fraternity system and a multitude of other details covered in this booklet... The Institute prepared as a corollary to this volume *A Bibliography of the United States* which is now in press... The Institute secured the services of some of the best authorities in the different fields of scholarship and will shortly issue an annotated bibliography which will not be exhaustive but will be a most valuable guide to the foreign student as to the best books to read on the geography, resources, population and social-conditions, government, history, literature, and education of the United States."

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS.—One hundred and twenty-six institutions were represented at the eleventh meeting of the Association, held at Washington University, April 25-27. There was discussion of the mortality rate in freshman classes, and of technical aspects of the registrar's work.

THE UNITED STATES BUREAU OF EDUCATION BULLETIN, 1921, No. 21, contains (page 14) a brief report on salaries at public and private colleges and universities, extracts from the Report of our Committee on the Place and Function of Faculties in University Government and Administration, a discussion of intelligence tests, and the recommendations of our Committee on Requirements for the Doctor's Degree.

## RECENT EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

EDUCATIONAL DETERMINISM; OR DEMOCRACY AND THE I. Q.—  
“Let me now examine the basic assumption that underlies the whole theory of mental measurements. Native mentality or native intelligence, the determinist himself will admit, is not directly measured by the tests. What is measured? *We never measure inborn intelligence; we always measure acquired intelligence, but we infer from differences in acquired intelligence, differences in native endowment when we compare individuals in a group who have had common experiences and note the differences in the attainment of these individuals.*’

“This, then, is the assumption back of the I. Q. which is playing so important a part now in our educational programs and which threatens to overturn the entire theory and practice of democratic education. The validity of mental measurements and of every inference that is drawn from the alleged facts that the measurements have disclosed is based upon the assumption that *with respect to the materials of the tests* the environment, the experience, the education, the stimulation, and the inspiration of those compared have been identical. We have had assumptions in science before this; in fact, the history of science is largely the history of assumptions and hypothesis. They have their place. *This particular assumption has its place*, and restricted to this place I grant its pragmatic justification. . . The tests measure a certain ability or group of abilities, but the contributions of experience become so numerous and influential and these vary so widely even among individuals of fairly homogeneous groups that it is the height of absurdity to contend that it is a native and unmodified factor that is being measured. Yet this contention is made the basis of sweeping conclusions regarding what education can or cannot do. If the determinist claims scientific validity for these extensions of his theory I say without fear of contradiction that no theory in the whole history of science has been based on a group of assumptions so questionable.

“Let us see how the determinist abuses his assumptions. On the basis of tests which admittedly measure the influence of experience he argues back to a hypothetical factor which, far from having isolated, he has never clearly defined. The closest that he has come to

a satisfactory definition is to call this factor 'ability to learn.' He then, by an act of pure imagination, reads out of the product everything that experience, education, and training have contributed. Until recently he has had no notion how much they have contributed or where their contribution stops. Within a month he has been confronted with the conclusion, based upon the very statistical methods upon which he himself has relied, that not less than 54 per cent of whatever it is that is measured as native intelligence turns out to be the result of experience and training. And yet his confidence in his early inferences seems to be unshaken. He makes some confident statements about the residue that he calls mentality or native intelligence. . But whenever the growth stops, whenever this hypothetical native mentality matures, there suddenly appears an abrupt restriction of the further educational possibilities of the great masses of people. Its essential nature for these people never changes; whatever it is, they have so much of it and no more. For the chosen few, however, further education is not only a possibility but the very hope of civilization. By this time the factor, which originally was ability to learn or 'take education,' has become ability to 'deal in abstractions.' A little later, through some alchemy, it becomes 'initiative' or ability to solve new problems. Finally, it emerges into a full-blown capacity for 'leadership.'

"Armed with this simple formula, the determinist now starts out to make over education.

"Take a man whom you would find by your measurements to be of average or even somewhat below average mentality,—the 'common man,' in short,—the *Homo ubiquitus* whose educational opportunities I am attempting to safeguard. Take this man in his daily business. Does he not grow in his power to deal abstractly with problems as he becomes increasingly familiar with them? I assert most emphatically that he does. I further assert that *with the proper kind of instruction* he can be taught to deal with many of the abstract problems that the determinist has in mind when he proposes to exclude everyone except the high I. Q.'s from the privileges of secondary and higher education. The question as to whether society can profitably undertake such an educational enterprise I shall consider in a moment when I shall prove to you that society either must undertake it or perish. . .

"I come now to the most fundamental tendency of the theories

which the determinist has constructed, again not on the basis of his facts, but upon the basis of his assumptions. I refer to the inevitable application of his inferences, with all of their questionable logic, to the theory of democracy and to the ideals of democratic education.

"Here the professional writers are fairly wary and circumspect. They are not anti-democratic. Far from it; only democracy does not mean what most people have believed. Intelligence is not everything, they assure us; it is only one of the many innate traits that condition achievement. A person may have a high degree of intelligence and still be a failure in life; or he may succeed on a fairly slender margin. Of late, too, the determinist has discovered that the inescapable differences in native intelligence fit in admirably with our industrial development. If automatic machinery provides gainful occupation for the predetermined human automaton, the evils that Mr. Pound and others have conjured up regarding the Iron Man of modern industry become of trifling significance. I have not yet seen this suggestion extended from modern industry to modern art, but it might well be. I refer not chiefly to futuristic painting or to free verse, but to the modern universal drama of the screen where, more emphatically even than in modern industry, the moron seems to have come at last into a real kingdom. . .

"Let us come to the real issue, namely, the need of democracy for a high level of trained and informed intelligence as a basis for collective judgment and collective action. We can not dodge this issue by saying that those who can not readily 'take' this kind of education may take some other kind that is far better for them individually. This may be true, but let us not deceive ourselves by calling it democratic. It is not democracy as a theory but as a stupendous fact that education must consider. *The development of democracy has been unquestionably toward the elevation of the common man to a position of supreme collective control.* Within a century in our own country, the franchise has been made universal. Our government is a representative government in form; in fact, it is coming every day closer to a type of direct government controlled by the great masses of the people. It is this variety of democracy that has lately spread through the world. It is this variety of democracy that was imperiled in 1914 and saved in 1918. *It can not now be a question of going back to an earlier form of social control.* It



is now, as it has never been before, a 'race between education and annihilation.' If education is to save civilization it must lift the common man to new levels—and not so much to new levels of industrial efficiency as to new levels of thinking and feeling. . .

"There is, however, a factor connected with this matter of 'leadership' that merits the most serious attention. The qualities that make for democratic leadership, far from being exclusively intellectual qualities, are not even predominantly so. They are rather 'human' qualities, such as sympathy, tact, humor, and sociability, and 'moral' qualities, such as integrity, industry, persistence, courage, and loyalty . . .

"The proposal to apply the intelligence tests in selecting at an early age those who are to be the later leaders of the nation has received a sanction, and in my humble judgment a most specious sanction, from the unquestioned success of the tests in the Army. In picking out the men who are better able than their fellows to learn new duties quickly, tests which measure this capacity have an obvious value. In how far these men owed their superiority to innate traits and in how far to education, we have now no certain means of knowing, although the determinist is as usual cocksure that education had nothing to do with it. Be that as it may, to argue from the situation in the Army to the situation in the nation as a whole overlooks a very important difference. The personnel of the Army does not choose its own leaders; the personnel of the nation does. The personnel of the Army does not pass final judgment on the plans and policies that the Army seeks to realize; the personnel of the nation does . . .

"The determinist admits that skillful and devoted teachers can do something even with morons. As I watch these teachers at their work it is not what they can not do that impresses me, it is rather the miracles that their consummate art enables them to perform. I have seen dull eyes lighted with a momentary gleam of intelligence. It was a little light in a world of darkness. But grant that little light glowing with rapidly increasing intensity as we go up the intelligence scale, and my case is won. A little more light for the common man this year, next year, a hundred years from now, and the battle for humanity, for democracy, and for brotherhood is won."

WILLIAM C. BAGLEY, in *School and Society*.

(291)

TESTS FOR ABILITY BEFORE COLLEGE ENTRANCE.—“The observation just made seems to the writer to agree with one’s general impression regarding the performance of the more capable students and it suggests that something is lacking in the opportunities and incentives which the college offers these more capable persons. What we know is that a large part of their time and energy goes to extra-curricular activities. We believe that this should be so and yet it is our duty to consider whether a due proportion is maintained, and if not, how a better balance is to be secured. . .

“Two striking facts are brought out by the table. First, a relatively large number of students, 168 out of 366 or about 46 per cent, were members of no student organization of any kind. . . Over one hundred organizations were listed, including athletic, literary, debating, dramatic, professional, linguistic and national, religious, musical, private clubs and honor societies, as well as all the administrative and student self-government boards. That these organizations offer admirable opportunities for education and self-development can not be denied and it is a great misfortune—not to say a miscarriage of university ideals—that nearly half of the students seem to have no part whatever in the activities.

“The second important fact is that the student activities are supported chiefly by the better class of students. The number of memberships in proportion to the total number of students to draw from is greatest for those in the higher ranks. It is for this group of students that the question needs to be raised whether they give too large a portion of their time and energy to these extra-curricular activities, especially those who are members of four or more organizations each. It is not clear what effect these general student organizations have on scholarship except as they contribute to the foundation of ideals and traditions in the college. . .

“The fact regarding student associations and their influence on scholarship are too elusive to admit of definite judgment. The impression which the writer gets from such facts as the foregoing are three: (1) the fraternities and sororities do not contribute to the improvement of scholarship; (2) that other organizations take too large a part of the time of some students who are capable of high scholarship; and (3) some students who fail or who make an indifferent success in college might be helped not only in their business and social relationship but in their studies as well, if they enjoyed the

stimulus and directive influences of one or more live student organizations...

"This study seems to show not only that information obtainable at the time of entrance will give an adequate basis for sectioning classes and advising students on the basis of their ability but also that it will enable us to distinguish between those who will certainly fail in college and those who succeed. In state institutions it may not be desirable to actually refuse admission to even the most unpromising but it is our duty when our information is reliable enough, to advise young men and women in advance on the basis of the experience in college of other people who had similar equipment. If we can say to the public that during the last five years all students who came to college with certain weaknesses in their equipment have failed, most students will take our advice when we show them that they are weak in the same ways. Similar publicity regarding the success in college and afterward of those who came well equipped may induce capable young people to take a serious interest in their studies from the beginning of their course."

J. B. JOHNSTON, in *School and Society*.

CHILD LABOR AND MENTAL AGE.—"The distribution of degrees of intelligence among the general population, as indicated by the army tests, has been the subject of considerable discussion. It appears that, excluding the lowest grades of feeble-mindedness, ten per cent of the population is of 'very inferior' intelligence; fifteen per cent, of 'inferior' intelligence; twenty per cent, 'low average;' twenty-five per cent 'average;' sixteen and a half per cent, 'high average;' nine per cent, 'superior;' and four and a half per cent, 'very superior.' Or, otherwise stated, ten per cent is limited to a mental age of not over ten; twenty-five per cent, of not over eleven; forty-five per cent, of not over twelve; and seventy per cent, of not over thirteen or fourteen. On the assumption that the age-grade progress of school children corresponds with their intelligence, it has been concluded that seventy per cent of our boys and girls are incapable of acquiring a high school education; twenty-five per cent of going beyond the fifth grade; and ten per cent of finishing the fourth. It has been pointed out that, according to the figures of the federal Bureau of Education, thirteen per cent of our school children actually do drop

out in the fourth grade or earlier and that sixty-nine per cent do not complete the eighth grade.

"Before accepting it as true that early school-leaving is wholly or chiefly due to deficient intelligence and that continuance in school is dependent on the grade of intelligence, it might be well to measure the mentality of groups of children who have left school—working children, in particular—and compare the results with results obtained by examination of children who have stayed in school. There is some reason for believing that a large proportion of working children are of rather high degrees of intelligence and that success in school is not entirely dependent on sheer intelligence. Binet says that 'memory is a great simulator of intelligence,' and we might add that with the methods in vogue in our present schools it is in many cases a pretty good substitute. We should keep in mind the fact that intelligence tests do not by any means measure the whole of ability and do not discover special aptitudes and abilities. Great ability may go with small intelligence; such traits as initiative, originality, loyalty, determination, persistence and pluck represent ability.

"In saying this we are on debatable ground, but instances in support of the statement could be cited. It is not a denial of the existence of a close correlation between 'intelligence' and 'moral qualities,' though conclusive proof of such a correlation has not yet been adduced. A correlation, however, does not necessarily mean that the 'moral qualities' are incapable of being trained and developed beyond 'intelligence.' Taking 'morality' in the ordinary meaning of the term, we have reason to believe that it flourishes among the intellectually humble of the population. We have long been accustomed, in public affairs, to place a good deal of reliance on the morality as well as the good judgment of 'the common people.' It is the common man, we should find it hard to deny, who is most strongly bound by the folkways and mores, by custom, tradition and public opinion. But rather startling is the fact that Dr. Herman Adler, who recently gave the army mental tests to all the inmates of all the penal institutions of Illinois, found that the distribution of intelligence for this group is the same as that for the general population. This may mean simply that the tests do not measure morality at all, or it may mean that the correlation of morality with intelligence is negligible.

"Taking the conclusions drawn from the army mental tests at anywhere near their face value, surely we must regard them as having



a very direct bearing on the question of a sixteen-year-old standard for leaving school and going to work. It is a psychological question as well as a physiological one. Why keep children in school if they are incapable of profiting by staying there? But maybe they could profit if we had different schools from those we have today. It has been suggested that the data on intelligence levels point to the necessity of picking out the children of the higher grades of intelligence and seeing that they are enabled to go on. The idea is that social and political salvation depends on a trained aristocracy of intelligence and that the schools belong to that aristocracy. The incapables may be charitably taken care of through special classes or may be allowed to depart at an early age. But, after all, do the schools belong to that aristocracy—to the few who are favored mentally, any more than to the few whose parents are favored with money? Do the high schools belong to the small minority who are able to complete the course? Would it not be just as wise to adapt the school system primarily to the needs of the eighty-five per cent who are now supposedly incapable of profiting by staying in school until they are sixteen? And provide the special classes for the highly intelligent? Would it not be just as wise to emphasize the educational needs of the group of 'high average,' 'average' and 'low average' intelligence (sixty per cent of the population) as the needs of the 'superior' and 'very superior' group (thirteen and a half per cent)?...

"There is a field for intensive education in developing not only new attitudes and ideals, but in sharpening and perfecting the mental tools with which we work. The existing stock of mental and moral powers and possibilities, neglected and unrealized among the people as a whole, is capable of greater service to individual and society. Stewart Paton has faith that all is not lost or hopeless: 'There seem to be a good many people who are very much concerned about the question whether civilization, having reached its highest point of development, has begun to decline. Some Jeremiahs are lamenting that the human race, having passed through the period of infancy, youth, and manhood, has already reached old age. As a matter of fact, there is plenty of evidence that man is still in a very early period of his development. He has always treated his brain, for example, very much in the same manner that a child does a complicated toy, and he takes little trouble to find out how to use this organ to the best advantage. Like a child, he has done a good deal to impair its



efficiency, and he only appeals for aid in learning how to manipulate it after serious damage has been done to the machinery.' The Princeton psychologist says that 'One result of this childish attitude has been the development of a sentimental and rhetorical, but not intelligent, interest in discussing the matters affecting his welfare such as peace and sanity, while he actually undertakes very little in a sane way to find out which processes should be cultivated and which eliminated, in order to develop a rational and peaceful attitude of mind. He wishes intemperately for international peace and sanity, but he takes few steps based upon any scientific knowledge of human behavior to bring about the fulfilment of his dreams.' We have by no means exhausted the possibilities of human capacity, whatever may be its limitations. That is exactly what education means, to take human capacity and make the very most of it. We must do that regardless of the eugenic prospect, and in so doing we shall fulfil the democratic ideal."

RAYMOND G. FULLER, in *Pedagogical Seminary*.

"GETTING BY:" A PROBLEM OF HIGH SCHOOLS.—"This paper deals more particularly with the pupil who neglects to develop his ability. Shall he be allowed to continue forming habits of indolence, and to get the impression that no more is required? At present the way is open to him; he needs only to 'get by.' Behind that fact he may shield himself, and the records confirm him in his stand. I think that most of us would be dissatisfied to have him go out from us with that low conception of a successful life. It may be that he could go his way through the world in that fashion; many do, but in this, as in the matter of competition and comparison, the school should be in advance of world conditions, and seek to send out its youth with higher ideals and aims, to the end that the world may become a little better through its influence. Besides, as I have already stated, right habits of thought and action, together with high ideals to serve as guides, are in reality the vital things of education, not scholarship, however well that may serve later as either an aid to bread-winning, to higher citizenship, or to greater enjoyment of life.

"In formulating the proposed new method of records, we are concerned with three factors: ability, relatively fixed, effort, and their product, achievement. The first of these three, ability, is becom-

ing more and more definitely capable of measurement as intelligence tests are formulated and put into practical use, but even without them the trained teacher has little difficulty after a month or so in distinguishing roughly the ability of the average pupil, as distinct from his achievement. Naturally, this ability will be found to vary somewhat according to the subject; also our estimate of it will perhaps have to be revised as we come to know the pupil better, but in general this factor will be fairly constant. Let us try rating this on the scale of ten, in which ten represents the highest ability we could expect of a pupil according to his chronological age, and zero, as near an absolute lack of ability as we can imagine; and let us use this rating as the denominator of a fraction which represents actual achievement in relation to this ability. To illustrate, Pupil A, a bright and diligent pupil, is rated with ability 9 and is doing his absolute best. He is therefore doing  $9/9$  of what he might do. Pupil B is bright, but extremely lazy. His ability is also 9, but he is doing little to develop that ability and put it to use, say  $3/9$  of his possible attainment. Pupil C is rather poor, with ability 6, but is doing his level best. His mark would then be  $6/6$ . This mark on its face indicates to teacher or principal all three factors for any individual. For a comparative rating, the addition of numerator and denominator will give, on a scale of 20, as fair an estimate of comparison between pupils as we have now or as we need, while the fraction still serves as an analysis of his success or failure. It will be noted that Pupil A has a score of 18, B has 12, and C, 12. But B and C are shown at a glance to be very different types, a fact which does not appear on our present records, but which is really the most valuable information we could have concerning their educational progress.

"I can imagine that at once these questions will arise: How shall we determine promotion and diploma credit? What report shall we give to the pupils of their progress? What information shall we send home to parents? What records shall teachers keep upon which to determine the monthly or bi-monthly mark? Let me try to answer them in order. Also let me say that this whole outline is to be regarded as suggestive rather than as final. So far as I know, no such experiment as this has ever been tried, and improvements are to be expected. The only thing to which I should insist we hold firmly is that we shall keep before the pupil no ideal other than that of his own best, that he shall have that always before him, with the

constant thought that he must live up to it. His conscious endeavor must be to fit himself in the highest degree possible to assume his share of the world's work, to play well his part as a citizen and to appreciate and enjoy to the full in a wholesome manner his hours of recreation, in short, to become the best possible type of all-round man. All else must be subordinate to keeping clearly and strongly in view at all times this great aim. And to focus his attention still more closely upon it, he should be led as much as possible to think of his future, with a view to determining so far as he can those vocations for which he is best fitted and his chances of entering upon them."

C. E. PRESTON, in *Educational Review*.

INTELLIGENCE TESTS FOR PROSPECTIVE FRESHMEN.—"The time is past for discussing the effectiveness of mental alertness tests. They are effective. The executives of colleges and of universities must direct their future development and use for prospective freshmen. . .

"When a prospective freshman seeks entrance at a particular college rather than at the hundreds of other colleges, he does so because he believes his chosen college will render him greater service than the others. To this college he entrusts his future in a degree that many of us have failed to appreciate. If he has already determined his life calling then he expects the college to prepare him for success in that calling. Very frequently he expects the college to guide him in the choice of a career as well as to prepare him for it. His trust is unjustified unless the college thus selected makes his interest a matter of first concern. Because all our colleges are overcrowded, and because the tuition charged the freshman pays for only half the cost of his education, we are likely to become selfish and heartless in our treatment of each applicant.

"The time has arrived for a new epoch in our system of education. It is an epoch in which the form of training will not be determined by such standards as the needs of the adult society or the available courses of instruction, but primarily by the needs of the youth to be educated. An essential part of such an educational system will be vocational and educational advice given by members of the teaching staff, by the dean, by members of the department of education or by an expert bearing some such title as Educational Councilor or preferably Personnel Director. The Personnel Director will

perform an educational function similar to that of the diagnostician in medicine. The instructors of the various courses will perform a function similar to that of the experts in the various curative specialties...

"The Personnel Director will need to know as much as possible of the training, the interest, the ambition, the talents, and the educational needs of all students and of all prospective students. The giving of mental alertness tests will be as much a matter of routine with such a Personnel Director as is the use of the clinical thermometer by the diagnostician in medicine.

"At the hands of a Personnel Director no prospective students will be ruthlessly eliminated, although the vocational or educational guidance given him may be to send him to another institution of higher learning or to some other place even better adapted to his needs.

"Mental alertness tests should not be given to prospective freshmen by those who fail to recognize the responsibility of the college to such applicants. Any college that has an adequate personnel department will recognize its responsibility to its applicant and will naturally give mental alertness tests in the attempt to meet such responsibility and to seek the highest interest of each prospective freshman.

"The administrative officers of the colleges might well plan for a greater emphasis on vocational and educational guidance and for such agencies for promoting the welfare of the student as are embraced under the general term of Personnel Administration. It is time for us to hold conferences on the subject, to appoint to our faculties experts in personnel administration and to make use of all approved tools of personnel administration including, of course, mental alertness tests for prospective freshmen."

WALTER DILL SCOTT, in *School and Society*.

THE INTELLECTUAL INTERESTS OF UNDERGRADUATES.—"The superiority of the past may be less than some think. . . The writer had not at his orders a superior specimen of the undying people whom Gulliver found in Luggnagg, but he conceived a great curiosity. Accordingly he read the early biography of some thirty-five prominent Americans, from George Ticknor to Theodore Roosevelt, whose college life fell in the first seventy-five or eighty years of the nineteenth



century, and in eleven colleges. For the forty years since then little biography is available, and we must trust our memories. . .

"A critical reader will not overlook the mental discipline and cultivation which result from four years of even a narrow curriculum even though pursued with no great interest or industry. There is frequent testimony for this from such students many years later. But my total impression, after enquiring of my several dozen witnesses, is that the curriculum and professors did surprisingly little to increase intellectual interests in those who brought them, or to develop them in those who did not; that students were led to the water conscientiously enough, but whether they drank of the water of life freely, or merely sipped and disgorged mud and sand, was their affair. Our modern college teaching, with its tendency to close specialization on the part of the professor, may have lost some of the richness brought the older colleges by the men of the widest culture among their faculties; but we have such men still, and I am not sure that the average professor of fifty or a hundred years ago improves on acquaintance. There can simply be no comparison between the general mental stimulus offered by the college courses, and personally by the professors, then and now. And I believe that, for whatever reason, students are much more interested in their studies now than then.

"But of spontaneous intellectual interest and activity, then, I believe, on an average there was more. The students were boys, it is true. We need not view a distressing sight of our grandfathers staying in on a fine afternoon to read Carlyle's latest, or Darwin's first; I should say they were more likely to have been depositing a bomb in the chapel stove (a frequent pastime), or leading a cow upstairs into the room of an eccentric professor. I recognize, too, that my witnesses, and probably their chief friends, were men of exceptional ability, and that among contemporary students we probably think of the average; also that not a little quiet reading and thinking are going on through all the modern college hubbub. The modern student, like his grandfather, is often intelligently and keenly interested in the urgent political and economic questions of the day. But I believe there was more desire then to keep up with the latest books of the more serious kind, more disposition to discuss them, more shame of ignorance, less fear of taking one's self seriously, less fear of being thought a prig. As to the college students of our



own day, their infinite varieties cluster about three types as nuclei: those who desire training for a profession (including teaching), those who desire a general education, and those who care less for education of any kind than for something else. The professionals prevail rather more in the West, the general-culture people and the loafers in the East. The professionals and the loafers have increased, the others have decreased. With the far greater richness and generosity of opportunity offered by the college of today the lassitude of the response is striking.

"As to the causes of the decline, or the deficiency, of intellectual interests, they will be found chiefly in the new ideals of our own day, and in the competition of other interests. Our students both love Caesar more and Rome less, and none will deny that they gladly render unto Caesar the things that are his. With all of us the intellectual life has to meet far hotter competition than seventy-five years ago, and most of all with college students. It was not till the final quarter of the last century that athletics became prominent in college life. Beneficial as they are to those who engage in them, especially where we are able to make the number large, and wholesome as are the standards which they help to maintain for everyone, they are an element in the situation. Amusements are more alluring than ever before, and metropolitan pleasures are to be found in the remote country. The drama, which once could be found all the time only in large cities, now in the form of moving pictures is in every village. Our modern speed and comfort in moving about promote restlessness and unsteadiness. The automobile, an amusement itself, facilitates all others. . Students who throw themselves wholeheartedly into college life come to regard their studies as a disagreeable avocation from their main concerns. A certain momentum is necessary to mental achievement, and constant interruption by more vivid occupations promotes superficiality in work. Intellectual matters filled a much larger place in the thoughts of students seventy-five years ago...

"This prominence of vocational aims is one of the chief differences between our modern and the earlier college education, and is really one of the distractions from the free intellectual interests of undergraduates, who have not yet earned the right of graduate professional students to narrow their interests. Once the college did not have to insure liberality of education by 'distribution requirements;'

the students' own desires saw to it. The curriculum, further, which bore directly on no profession (except perhaps teaching), was of a kind to foster general intellectual interests."

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK, in *University of California Chronicle*.

SECTIONING CLASSES ON THE BASIS OF ABILITY.—"This new knowledge cuts at the root of one of the most pernicious theories of educational systems, namely, the assumption that where the great Creator failed to make all human beings equal, it is the business of the school to make them equal...

"The democratic ideal in education, as everywhere else in life, is not equal distribution to all, but equal opportunity in proportion to capacity...

"With a glow of charitable sentiment the instructor says, 'It is good for the poor student to hear the good student recite.' The fact is, it is not good: the humiliation is often heartrending; the facts recited, if at the level of the good student, are beyond his comprehension, and the movement of the recitation is far beyond his pace; it is gross injustice. The claim that the traditional procedure is justified by results presents a specious element of truth in the fact that the school actually often succeeds in discouraging initiative, cutting the wings of imagination, lowering ideals, and recognizing inferior standards, so that the superior student comes out from the system not much different from the inferior.

"In this discussion we must distinguish clearly between what the student *can* do and what he *does*; between the existence of capacity and the evidence of achievement; for there is in education, as in unionism in labor, a strong tendency to equalize the output regardless of differences in capacity for output.

"If, then, we seek for an economic basis for the sectioning of classes, we shall do well to recognize three levels which we may call the *high*, the *middle*, and the *low*, the middle being as large as the other two together, giving us one 'high' and two 'middle,' and one 'low' division...

*Some advantages in this method of sectioning:*

"(1) It becomes possible to apply in teaching the pedagogical maxim, which is the outcome of the discovery of the individual; namely, 'Keep each student at his highest level of achievement in order that he may be successful, happy, and good.'

"(2) This will result in the setting up of fair standards for *quantity, quality, content* and *method* of work. In these four fundamental respects the needs of the high and the low students are radically different. The high students can go fast and take long lessons, can do a better quality of work, and can acquire a more genuine understanding and first-hand grasp of the situation. As to content, they can consider topics which are entirely beyond the reach of the low students, and the method of conducting the class can be entirely different, particularly in taking advantage of the capacity for discussion, extensive reference work, freedom of initiative, and experiments. On the other hand, the low students, with equally hard work, should cover a limited territory on lower standards of quality; they should, therefore, be limited to such content as is within their reach and should work by such methods as will meet their peculiar needs.

"(3) This, in turn, will establish a fair basis for *praise* and *blame*. In the present system we do injustice to the high student by accepting from him mediocre work; we do injustice to the low student by blaming him for not coming up to a standard which lies entirely beyond his capacity: our praise and our blame are equally unjust and injurious. The classification on the basis of ability, and acquaintance with individual ability within the section, is essential to a fair distribution of praise and blame when dealing with a large class of students. This is true from the student's as well as the teacher's point of view. The students tend to praise and blame one another on the same farcical basis of a common standard. Indeed, it is in good taste for the good student to hold himself down to a modest level, exactly as in the artificial condition in union labor.

"(4) The introduction of fair standards of achievement creates morale in the class. The capable student who has been loafing is the one who is most likely to be affected by this method. Each man, be he high, average, or low, is made to feel responsible for himself, feel his opportunity, feel the stimulus for competition, feel the joy of achievement, feel the approval of a clear conscience, feel busy, feel the sense of power, feel the joy of approbation, if deserved.

"(5) There will, therefore, be a larger output at all three levels, partly by elimination of the unnecessary and the introduction of the fit content. A visitor to an ordinary college class will find that one-fourth of the pupils are beyond the stage of instruction and for them

the class exercise serves as a deadening of their best sensibilities and enthusiasms; one-fourth of the class are not capable of comprehending or performing the task in hand, but sit listless and helpless and rightly regard themselves as unjustly abused; the members of the remaining half of the class represent a variety of conditions, but most of them are capable of profiting to some extent by the exercise.

"(6) One argument against the present plan on the part of those who have not tried it is that it is a hardship for the poor student. It must be clear from the preceding that the situation is quite the converse. It means kindness, comfort, justice, and relative efficiency for the poor student. It gives the poor student a fair chance, which the old system does not.

"(7) This classification serves as a means of discovering and encouraging the good and superior student; first, because there is throughout the course a vital and effective competition; second, because in this competition each student is working at his highest level; third, because this enables the high student to profit by the opportunity for initiative, freedom, expansion, and self-expression; and, fourth, because such associations are likely to awaken in him desire for progress, a sense of joy in achievement, and a feeling of fellowship...

"The plea for this method of sectioning on the basis of ability is thus presented by one who is confessedly an enthusiast for the method, having used it for several years with large sections in psychology, and having actually found means of overcoming obstacles in the way. It would, however, not be unreasonable to say that opposition to the plan can, after all, be most fairly presented only by one who has actually put it to experiment and has arrived at an adverse conclusion. At the present time I know of no one who has qualified for that task. Let us therefore apply a principle of science and, before we render a verdict on the plan, 'try it.' "

C. E. SEASHORE, in *School and Society*.

THE HUMANITIES AND THE TREND OF EDUCATION.—"Would it not be well if all our students—not only those who take the A.B. course and those in the Ph.B. group whose studies are in classical or modern literatures, but also those in the Ph.B. work who have specialized in economics and the social sciences, and all the science students—would it not be well, I ask, if they could have some of



this humanistic study? Not that I would suggest that they should love their science or their economics less, but that they should love literature and art a little more. Are they really educated if they leave our halls without an intelligent understanding of the significance of literature, whether they choose Greek or Latin, French, German, Italian, or English as the medium through which to attain that end? If they go out without it, what is to distinguish them from the graduates of any technical school or commercial college? Might there not be at least one course in art where there are a dozen in accounting? Will our graduates and will the graduates of other colleges and universities join the ranks of those who raise the standard of their community's culture? Or will they belong to the great mass of those who become absorbed in their own individual pursuits and never even get a glimpse, over the edge of the pit in which they are working, of those larger issues which make life worth living? .

"The tendency of our age indeed is crassly materialistic, and it is this that in the main is determining the character of our education. In my distant youth I remember having a vague impression that the university dictated to the colleges and the colleges to the schools, and that the whole complex of educational institutions directed the thought of the country. Under the domination of this idea I pictured the very venerable gentleman who was the president of the university where I was a student as a kind of academic pope, whose word in all intellectual matters was law, who was infallible, who could make and unmake curricula, and whose hand guided the destinies of his university and through it the thought of the province. It is a long time since I awoke from that dream, and with my waking came the realization that far from showing the way, the educational institutions simply trail on behind. Perhaps that misguided idea of mine would never have been born if I had not belonged to a generation in which there were college entrance requirements, and colleges and universities did maintain some pretension of controlling the course of study in the schools. But that state of things has long since gone in the West, and is going fast in the East. No, it is not the university that is the head of that chimera which we call education. It is the local school board that is head, for it determines what shall be taught in the grade and high schools, and the schools swing the colleges and universities. The university is the monster's tail, which wags far too contentedly at its master's voice. But it

may be urged: "This is just as it should be. We are a democracy, and our educational system from grade school to university, from kindergarten to doctorate, should embody the standards of the people and should reflect their ideas." This argument is not without plausibility; it is from some points of view logical enough. But like all theories based on the wishes of the people it does not always work out well. There have been many high-minded members of school boards, men whose idealism yielded to that of none, and the debt that American education owes to them is too vast for measurement. It is to them that we who are teachers of the humanities are indebted for everything we have. If it had not been for them, the study of literature, either in our own or in foreign languages, would never have been made a constituent part of the curriculum. It was they who put the classics into the schools of the eastern states in the early days, and the schools established in the West modeled their courses on the eastern foundations. There was in those far-off times a genuine respect for learning, and those who organized the courses provided not only studies of the bread-and-butter sort but also those that would enlarge the vision of the students, give them some idea of the civilizations that had flourished and passed, yet had not passed without leaving some heritage; studies that would enable even the most mediocre student to see his own age in juster perspective and take a more comprehensive, a more intelligent, and a more enlightened view of the conditions of life in his own day and generation—studies that would minister to his imagination also and give him at least a chance to develop an appreciation for what was fine in literature and art. Nor were those early New Englanders dreamers. Good business men everyone knows them to have been. But they were not merely business men, and in the schools they built they provided for more than commercial efficiency. The test of any system is its results, and you will remember that what is best in American literature was the product of the old literary courses. But men of this kind, whose minds see beyond the immediate present, who realize that a boy's education must provide not only for the first few years of his business life but for all those many years that follow, men who have range and idealism of the right sort, are now in the minority. The majority consists of individuals who have succumbed to that materialism of which I have spoken. It is they who ultimately control educational policy and make the curriculum, and the

curriculum more and more reflects this baleful materialistic tendency . . .

"The pest of our civilization, then, is the cry for practical efficiency. We are in a fair way to being ruined by our efficiency. The term itself is a good one; the idea is an excellent one. Where the trouble lies is in the interpretation of it. For 'practical' is mere camouflage for 'immediate,' and our whole educational system is crowded (and the congestion is increasing every day) with short-cuts to this or that type of proficiency. Of that short-cut to business success which is now devastating our high-school course, and which is filling business houses with boys with permanently crippled minds, I have already spoken. But the movement has not stopped at the high school. In many of our colleges and universities the schools of commerce and administration are literally devouring the college of liberal arts. This camel put its head into the college tent a generation ago when courses in political economy became a regular part of the curriculum and presently it will be the sole occupant. Students are crowding into the commercial classes, for they are convinced that they are killing two birds with one stone: they are getting a college degree and they are acquiring a training in what they regard as the only things of any value to them. On this latter point their minds are fully made up. To their untutored intelligence only that study which has immediate bearing on money-making is useful. That they should have this opinion is not of course surprising. It is a quality of youth and immaturity. It is as natural, at their time of life, as the down upon a freshman's cheek, or the noise and horse-play of a fraternity house, or the smart chatter of a sophomore, or the loose slopping galoshes of a jaunty co-ed. These are the things of youth. What is surprising is that those who organize our colleges and make the curriculum should take no measures to prevent the wrecking of the liberal arts course.

"The reason why they do not has already been indicated. The universities do not lead the thought of the world; they merely follow the popular trend, and the age is unblushingly materialistic. The goal that is kept constantly in mind, that is pointed out insistently to the young, is financial success. And the colleges have adapted their courses to the popular demand. The college course is the mirror of society, and the society of today, so far as literary ideals are concerned, is a decadent society."

GORDON LAING, in *The University Record*.

THE STUDENT AND THE SCHOLAR.—“To remedy all these defects we need the real spirit of the scholar. The American student is not only the victim of his environment; he is also, to a large extent, the victim of too much system and method. No freer country in the world, no student more jealous of his own initiative. How is it that in so many instances the student is found to be passive in the class room, so slow to take upon himself his own responsibilities? . . . Born in the land of the brave, the home of the free, he lives in a world of prescriptions, assignments, requirements, and regulations. While the European student becomes of age and really ‘comes out’ when he enters the university, the American student remains in bondage and a minor in college. His liberty he may take anywhere outside the university. Within the precincts of the campus he often is like a prisoner. He must keep in tune with the spirit of the place, live by the traditions and regulations of his class, of his club, of his team, and when he comes to study he finds himself beset on all sides by do and don’t. His education is not a free meal *à la carte*; everything is served to him per a laid down order and the whole etiquette of the *table d’hôte* is prescribed without his choosing. He is told what books he must read, and how many pages of them—a cut and dried program. The lure of the unknown is too often absent from his course of study. Not only is he told the books he must read and how many pages, but also the way he must do it, and sometimes, even, he is told that there is only one way. As he is the slave of quantity, he is in danger of being the slave of system. The number of pages he must read is only equal to the number of systematic experiments to which he must submit. Now there would be, even for the most unsympathetic observer, something beautiful and almost heroic in that discipline so genially accepted, in this fine equanimity and sportsmanship of the student, were it more consciously and deliberately accepted.

“To those evils let us oppose the true spirit and the ideal of the scholar. No word calls more for precise definition. It is impossible to define it but by saying that each age has had its different notion and definition of the scholar. Whatever that may be, one thing stands out. If the defects and evils described above are not entirely imaginary, the scholar seems to be the man qualified to remedy them. If motion, velocity, excess of fluidity and speed, restlessness, bowing to the idols of quantity, are signs of the times, none seems to be better qualified than the scholar to change them.



"Quality, steadfastness, equanimity, repose, and poise are the the standards and ideals of the scholar. Inclined as he may have been in ages bygone to become an omnivorous eclectic like Pico della Mirandola, Rabelais, or Erasmus, he very soon became something else, a man of taste, a connoisseur in the field of knowledge, a seeker after the most refined in culture. Quality is the motto of the scholar, not on the faith of publicity but of critical sense indorsed by tradition. The scholar is he who after painstaking comparison and careful selection can appreciate. Intellect not devoid of imagination and constant acquaintance with the best minds of all ages are his method of arriving at truth. Of the scholar as of the gentleman it may be said that he never hurries, not because he is lazy but because he is careful and an amateur of perfection . . .

"The scholar can be modest. He holds that one must study much if he wishes to know a little. The scholar is sociable, he is courteous, a gentleman, and a man of the world. However much he may know, others will never find out. He can put up with other people's knowledge and serve as second to him who can prove himself first. To be gracious, affectionate, noble, humorous, generous, responsive, all this is the ideal of the scholar. A responsiveness of sympathy and a fine generosity which evoke an answering enthusiasm, stimulating, exhilarating, open-minded and open-hearted, this was said recently of William James and may be repeated of the true scholar. However natural they may seem, these virtues and qualities are for the scholar less the gift of nature than the product of culture. Nature cultivated, culture made natural, appeal to him. Plato, Cicero, Montaigne, Voltaire, Goethe, Matthew Arnold, Ruskin, Anatole France, these are among his masters and models. His enthusiasm for culture marks the scholar. He is willing to burn of that gemlike flame of which Walter Pater spoke, provided it be lighted at the altar not of dilettantism but of humanism."

RÉGIS MICHAUD, *Phi Beta Kappa address, at the University of California.*

THE EARLY TRAINING OF SCIENTISTS.—"It is a strange feature of the modern educational process that though children are born richly endowed with scientific instincts into a world which has gladly accepted a multitude of gifts from science, they encounter, from the

cradle to the university, constant opposition to the education of these instincts.

"The child is excellent raw material for the making of the scientist. First of all, he is curiosity incarnate; he does not confine his attentions to those matters which adults consider practical, but tries to learn all he can about an environment which he finds brimming with interest. Moreover, he is an experimentalist, and the days are too short for the experiments he wishes to perform upon everything at hand, from the bric-à-brac to the patience of his elders. He relies upon experiment rather than upon authority for learning truth. Authoritative representations concerning the fragile qualities of glass, the taste of pepper or the temperature of a stove are to him but suggestions for experiments. Although his experimental technique is simple and his capacity for reasoning and theorizing is undeveloped, he has made a splendid beginning towards a scientific career.

"In his further development, however, he meets with opposition at every turn. Many of his experiments earn punishment from his parents, who discourage his curiosity and even pervert the truth for their own ends. At school, book-learning is substituted for observation and experiment, and even when the topic is nature or science it is often taught in a very didactic way by a teacher who, though having taken many courses in pedagogy, may have but little appreciation of the spirit and method of science. At Sunday School he is likely to find a teacher who praises as religious virtue the docile acceptance of dogmatic authority and to whom the term 'doubt' is one of opprobrium.

"The repressive process, alas, does not end here, for we in the university who next take him in hand delight in giving him the impression that the subject has been thoroughly elucidated. We take little pains to help him to realize the existence of vast fields awaiting exploration. Moreover, we are so anxious to guard him from errors of fact that we announce in advance what he is expected to find in his experiments. He is told to mix solution A with solution B and 'to note the red precipitate which is formed.' The precipitate he gets may happen to be yellow, but he has learned by this time that it is safer to call it red in his note-book. Why quarrel with the instructor? It is wiser to give the answer he wants, and keep him in a good humor."

J. H. HILDEBRAND, in *Science*.

PROFESSORS, POLITENESS FIRST!—"The dispatch that brought the news of Mr. Edison's protest against Professor Scott's letter states that members of the Board of Regents of the University who have received copies of the correspondence 'intend to suggest an investigation of the matter at the next board meeting.' If this be so, it is another illustration of the fact that, though much advance has been made in recent years in the understanding of the proper status of university professors, there still remains necessary a great deal of education of university boards on that point. To discipline Professor Scott for manfully asserting his opinion of an intellectual absurdity, to make him feel a moment's discomfort because he was not afraid to say an unpleasant thing to a big man, is to do precisely the opposite of what needs to be done about our university professors. The more you make them feel that to accept a professorship is to surrender your individuality, the smaller will be the breed of men who will be willing to go into university work. Usually the conflict between the outspoken professor and the regulator turns on a question of controversial opinion; in this case we have a question of the supposed requirements of good manners. But at bottom precisely the same issue is involved—the question whether we want our professors to be men or want them to be puppets. As between Mr. Edison and Professor Scott, it is quite possible that the professor was to blame for not being more polite in his letter, but it is just as intolerable that a professor should be held to account, like a child, for a breach of politeness of this kind as that he should be muzzled in the expression of his opinion on public questions. If we want our professors to be men, we must make them secure in the manifestation of their manhood. And if we want our students to get the inspiration they ought to get out of their university life, we must above all see to it that their professors are full-sized men."

*The Independent and the Weekly Review.*

NOTE.—The quotation (but not the title) "Subsidies for Attendance at Professional Society Meetings" in the April BULLETIN should have been credited to R. C. Brooks.

## LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

ADDRESS OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE NORMAN BRIDGE LABORATORY OF PHYSICS.—“Finally, I wish to accept this gift in the name of all those who believe, as I do and as the trustees of this institution have from the start believed, that science in itself is not the most important thing in this world, but that the salvation of the world is to be found in the cultivation of science together with the cultivation of a belief in the reality of moral and spiritual values. Science alone may destroy this world instead of saving it, but the trustees of this institution have from the start differentiated it from most technical schools in the altogether exceptional emphasis which has been laid in its curriculum upon cultural and spiritual development. One expression of this ideal is seen in the atmosphere which has been thrown about the campus by the architectural beauty of the buildings which are already found here, a beauty which the architect, Mr. Goodhue, has known how to put in exceptional degree both into the exterior and the interior of the Norman Bridge Laboratory. I accept your magnificent gift, Dr. Bridge, in the hope and the belief that it will be an important factor in the creation at the California Institute of Technology, not only of men with the highest technical skill, but of men of the finest character and of the broadest citizenship.”

R. A. MILLIKAN, in *Science*.

CLARK UNIVERSITY.—*Reorganization*. “A basic reorganization of Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts, has now been completed.

“Under the reorganization the distinction between the graduate and the undergraduate faculties is removed.

“The change of greatest general interest is the change in the college from the three-year basis to the ordinary four-year schedule. Up to the present the college had attempted to restrict its enrollment to exceptionally well-prepared men who desired to accomplish in three years the work for the bachelor's degree customarily covered in four years. Extra-curricular activities were largely eliminated under this system. The modification of this arrangement was



brought about because of increasing pressure on the one hand from students whose preparation was not exceptional and on the other hand from students who wanted intercollegiate athletics and other forms of student activities. A contributing factor was the difficulty which graduates of the college met in gaining recognition for an A.B. degree based on 108 semester hours. In the future Clark College will require 120 semester hours for graduation and will expect four years of residence. Students of satisfactory preparation who are willing to assume heavy programs may still have the opportunity to win the bachelor's degree in three years. But the large proportion of students will be on the four-year schedule.

"Among other changes is a project, passed by the faculty on first vote and soon to be voted on finally, to install a grading system based upon the ideas of ranking and of the normal distribution of abilities. In order to get away from the connotations of the former A, B, C, D, E system, the faculty will, for a time at least, give grades 1 and 2 to the upper 20-30 per cent of the class, with not over five per cent of grade 1; grade 3 to the middle 45-50 per cent; grade 4 and grade F to the lowest 20-30 per cent; with not over five per cent of grade F. Allowances are to be made in small classes and in exceptional cases."

*School and Society.*

## THE FREE SPEECH CONTROVERSY

### *Student Opinion*

"The Nearing episode at Clark University has developed into such importance that it seems desirable for the undergraduates to present certain aspects of the matter to the public in a special publication. While the newspapers have presented many of the facts they have failed to present others equally important, and, as is often the case in such matters, have played up the sensational aspects of the case. By this course they have succeeded in conveying a distorted view of the whole situation. . .

"In December, President Atwood gave his consent to a public meeting of the Clark University Liberal Club to be addressed by Dr. Scott Nearing. The meeting could not be arranged. Late in February the officers of the Liberal Club secured the consent of President Atwood for a meeting to be held on March 14th, to be

addressed by Dr. Nearing. A few days previous to the date of the meeting, President Atwood informed Mr. Fraser, president of the Liberal Club, that there was being arranged a geography lecture for that same night, and requested a postponement of the Nearing lecture. Mr. Fraser explained that postponement was impossible, and received the reply that the meeting might be held, but in a different hall from that originally assigned.

"Dr. Nearing's lecture had been in progress an hour and three quarters, when Dr. Atwood arrived. Within five minutes thereafter the President arose, and, declaring to Mr. Fraser that this was 'disgusting,' ordered Mr. Fraser to 'stop him,' 'tell him to stop.' Mr. Fraser went to the platform and spoke to Dr. Nearing, who immediately stopped his address. Dr. Atwood stepped to the platform, and with no explanation declared the meeting was dismissed. Amazement held the audience motionless. Dr. Atwood repeated in an angry manner several times 'this meeting is dismissed.' The bulk of the audience still remaining in the hall, Dr. Atwood in no uncertain manner ordered the janitor to extinguish the lights and intimated that the police might be summoned...

*Statement from the Clark University Student Body*

"We, the undersigned, duly elected executives, representing, respectively, every undergraduate student organization of Clark University, being desirous of clarifying in the eyes of the Trustees of Clark University, the President of Clark University, and the public our position regarding the policy of Clark University as an institution of higher learning, do hereby define our views and opinions:

"1. We do not advocate Socialism, Bolshevism, Communism or Anarchism.

"2. We do believe in the incontrovertible right and duty of educators, educational institutions, and most especially institutions of higher learning to teach, to discuss and announce the truth in whatever form it may appear, wholly free from coercion by any influence of special interest or insidious propaganda.

"3. Most pertinent to the present local situation, we believe that the issue is not bound up with support of socialistic or anarchistic doctrines. To such doctrines we do not subscribe.

"4. We do believe that Clark University ceases to exist as an institution of higher learning, when it is deprived of those peculiarly

characteristic principles enunciated by its benefactor and founder, Jonas Gilman Clark, and carefully nurtured by its former President G. Stanley Hall, throughout its previous existence.

"5. These principles are that there shall never be any abridgement of the inalienable right of self-expression within the environs of the University; that, in the words of the founder, which we believe to be peculiarly relevant to the situation, . . . its doors may be ever open to all classes and persons, whatsoever may be their religious faith or political sympathies, or to whatever creed, sect, or party they may belong.

"To this document we affix our signatures as properly delegated representatives of the undergraduates of Clark University. . .

"On Wednesday, March, 15, the representatives of the Student Body formally invited the President to address a special assembly. He was respectfully requested to set forth the future policy of his administration with reference to the freedom of utterance that had become traditional under former presidents. . ."

Extracts from the *Clark College Monthly*.

*Statement by President Atwood on Extra-Curricular Activities and Academic Freedom<sup>1</sup>*

I closed the meeting because I was unwilling to have the University, in any way, directly or indirectly, actually or apparently, responsible for our students' listening any longer to the sentiments which were being expressed by the speaker. The point at issue is not alone one of my disapproval of his malignment of the moral integrity of the American people. I take the position that not only the sentiments he was expressing, but the unscientific method of presentation, and the intemperate manner in which he was conducting that address, made it inappropriate for a university hall.

I believe in the freedom of speech. An open forum where all kinds of ideas may be aired, may serve a very useful purpose in our society, but I am certain in my own mind that a university should not be conducted on that basis. When you are admitted as students to this University, you are not by that act given the right or privilege of calling to the halls of this University any whom you may select to assist us in our educational work. All that comes into your

<sup>1</sup> Abstract of an address delivered at Clark University a few days after the President closed a meeting of the Liberal Club at which Mr. Scott Nearing was speaking.

lives while you are here has an educational influence upon you. Education is almost a mysterious process. Most significant lessons may come in some fraternity-home conversation, or on the athletic field, or when you work together to produce just as good a dramatic performance as you can. It may be that you learn the most important principles which are to guide you in life, in the gymnasium, in your Debating Society, or when some issue comes up in a student organization.

I consider the activities of the so-called Liberal Clubs in American colleges to be extra-curricular activities. As yet we have made no special provision here at Clark for overseeing or in any way directing these particular activities, and, therefore, until some other provision is made, I shall feel the responsibility of deciding what speakers you may invite to the University to address you in our halls, and what public meetings you may hold within the halls of this University.

The presentation of the two sides of a question, especially on questions affecting the social welfare of the community outside the immediate university circle, should be made without passion, without any intention of furthering misunderstanding, or of arousing antagonism or hatred in the minds of one group of people against any other group. The careful discrimination of the scholar and of the true teacher, who uses the scientific method of presentation, and who has the best welfare of the next generation at heart, will, while presenting the truth as he sees it, develop in the student a power of discrimination between that which is or is not an obvious detriment to public morals or the conduct of orderly government. He will never lead students to disrespect sincere religious beliefs.

We who wish academic freedom must always remember that we are members of a public service institution, granted special privileges because we have agreed to furnish special services for the good of society. While we appreciate and respect the members of the medical profession for the care they exercise in considering the physical welfare of individuals we must recognize as educators that we have entrusted to our care the minds and characters of the young people of this country. These young people are the dearest members of the home, and in them lies the hope of this nation. Our problem is to develop in them that strength of character and soundness of judgment which will assure the permanency of all that is good in our social, religious and governmental institutions, and we may hope that



through them that which is not good may be properly corrected.

Gentlemen, the words Academic Freedom to me simply spell Responsibility.

WALLACE W. ARWOOD.

*Statement by the Faculty*

At the request of the President, the Faculty of Clark University prepared the following statement regarding academic freedom in the University, and the regulation of certain extra-curricular activities of student organizations. This statement was unanimously adopted by the Faculty, approved by the President representing the administration, and approved also by the duly authorized representatives of the Graduate and Undergraduate Students of the University. It is their desire that this statement receive as wide publicity as possible.

1. The Faculty believes that the academic freedom of no member of the Clark Faculty has ever been trespassed upon and anticipates no danger of any such trespass.
2. As concerns the conduct of classes and the invitation of speakers before classes and seminars, the responsibility should rest, as it always has, with the instructor concerned.
3. As concerns public meetings under University auspices (by which in this instance is understood any gathering under student management open to persons not regularly enrolled as members of the institution) which must, in the nature of the case, carry a certain degree of University sanction, the Faculty is of the opinion that speakers should be introduced only with the official approval of a standing committee of the Faculty under the chairmanship of the President.
4. As concerns meetings of student organizations that are open to members of the institution in general, the Faculty is of the opinion that speakers from outside the institution should be invited only with the approval of a joint board in which students and Faculty are equally represented.
5. As concerns meetings of student organizations open only to their own regular membership, the Faculty recommends that the responsibility for the speakers invited and the conduct of the organization in general be placed upon the members of that organization, under the advice of a member of the Faculty elected by the organization.

The above statement has met with the approval of the Administration, the Faculty and the duly authorized representatives of the students.

---

"Dr. Atwood takes the position that the Faculty must exercise strict control over invitations from student bodies to outsiders for addresses; that no one like Scott Nearing can be admitted, and that if any speaker is indiscreet he should be summarily shut up.

"This kind of effort to put students in cotton batting is probably impracticable; it will strike most sensible men as inexpedient; and all liberal men will call it improper. And how is the Faculty to exercise this drastic censorship without laying itself open to the charge of arbitrariness? Would it let Gustavus Myers lecture on the history of the Supreme Court? Would it let G. H. D. Cole lecture on Guild Socialism? The moment it tries to draw a line against mere radicalism or loose thinking it involves itself in all sorts of difficulties. The inexpediency of the practice becomes plain when we consider the response most students will make. The banning of a lecture on Freudianism as "dangerous" would start an immediate rush on local libraries and bookstores for books on psychoanalysis. The interruption of Scott Nearing's speech has done more than anything else could to arouse interest in Nearing's ideas. The more a university relies upon the effectiveness of its own teaching and atmosphere the less it will worry about the students' occasional contacts with nonorthodox doctrines. It is a poor institution of learning if it does not take the view that students are more than passive vessels, that a little curiosity about extreme opinions is often a sign of healthy mental alertness, and that they have a right to learn something of the welter of conflicting opinions which make up the thought of the world."

*New York Evening Post.*

THE DARTMOUTH CHAPTER of the American Association of University Professors has discussed at recent meetings the attacks on the teaching of evolution now being made by members of the Fundamental movement.

The Chapter has already requested the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure of the American Association of

University Professors to investigate this matter, and is glad to learn that such an investigation is to be made.

From information that has come to members of the Chapter, it appears that many scientific men are inclined to underestimate the force of the movement. The avowed intention of the Fundamental group is to bring about the suppression in schools, colleges and universities, of scientific, philosophical and religious thinking which is not in accord with the beliefs of its members. It seeks to effect this suppression by causing resignations or dismissals of teachers holding views not approved by it, and by urging its members and those influenced by them to withhold their contributions from institutions, the teaching of which it does not approve.

The Chapter desires to put itself on record as unalterably opposed to any action by ecclesiastical or other authority, whether duly constituted or not, which shall hinder the search for truth or restrict the freedom of teaching. It recognizes that there can be no criticism of any person or persons who desire an investigation of such matters as the teaching of evolution and the expression of liberal opinions, but it insists that such an investigation can lead to useful and enduring results only when carried out by an impartial body.

GENERAL EXAMINATIONS AT HARVARD.—“For the first time in the history of Harvard College all seniors except those concentrating in mathematics and the natural sciences will be required during the month of May to take general examinations for graduation. The fact that nearly 300 men, or approximately three-fourths of the graduating class, will be subject to these general tests this year marks an important step in the development of the system of instruction at the college.

“Hitherto only seniors whose main work has been in history, government, or economics, or in the allied field of history and literature, have been subject to general examinations for graduation. This year, however, men who are concentrating in other subjects such as English, Romance Languages, the classics, philosophy, psychology, the fine arts and music must also undergo these general tests. Only men whose major work lies in mathematics or in the natural sciences will be exempt.

“The general examination, which thus becomes more firmly entrenched than ever before as a part of the Harvard system of in-

struction, is designed to test the senior's grasp of the entire field in which he has chosen to take his main work, and not merely of the subject-matter of such courses as he happens to have taken in that field. The man concentrating in economics, for instance, may have passed his individual courses in that subject satisfactorily, but until he passes the general examination, which shows whether or not he has mastered the subject as a whole and can think for himself in terms of economics, he cannot take his degree.

"The nature of the general examination varies with the subject, but in most cases it will consist this year of one or more three-hour written tests together with a short oral test of fifteen or twenty minutes. The man concentrating in American history, for instance, may be subject to a three-hour written test on that subject, a two-hour written test on the entire field of history, another two-hour test on the allied fields of government and economics, and the oral quiz as well. The man concentrating in English literature, on the other hand, must pass two three-hour written tests, one on English literature and the other on the Bible, the works of Shakespeare, and those of two selected classical authors. The test on Shakespeare and the Bible, in fact, will be required this year for every man concentrating in modern languages and in the classics, as well as for those working mainly in English literature.

"About eighty-five seniors are now preparing for the general examination in English, sixty-four in economics, thirty-eight in Romance languages, thirty in government and twenty-eight in history, with smaller numbers concentrating in other subjects.

"The men whose main work lies in mathematics or the natural sciences are exempted from the general examination on the theory that advanced courses in these subjects naturally require the use of knowledge gained in elementary courses, and a general test is therefore unnecessary.

"To aid men in preparing for these general examinations, Harvard is expanding its tutorial system. There are now twenty tutors in history, government and economics, employed by the college to give assistance and advice to men specializing in these subjects. Each tutor is assigned on the average some twenty students, of whom perhaps six or eight are seniors. They consult the tutor about their outside reading for the examination and other matters connected with their work, always informally and either singly or in small



groups. There are now several men acting as tutors in philosophy and psychology, two in history and literature, and one in the arts, while in other subjects the men are advised by teachers bearing some such title as 'supervisor' or 'adviser.'

"The part played by the general examination and the tutorial system in leading a student to correlate the facts that he picks up in various courses is illustrated by the story now current at Harvard of a man who learned about Alexander Hamilton in a course on American history, one on finance and one on literature, but didn't realize that these Hamiltons were all the same man until his tutor told him so.

"The general examination is described by President Lowell as aiming to fasten the attention of the undergraduate 'on the subject as a whole rather than on isolated fragments of it,' to help him 'to master the subject and make it his own,' and 'to impress on him the responsibility for his own education, for real value belongs only to self-education, acquired by personal effort. Teachers can help a man to obtain it but cannot stuff it into him ready-made.'"

MASSACHUSETTS STATE UNIVERSITY.—The State Legislature has recently voted "that a commission be appointed to report upon the opportunities and provision for technical and higher education within the Commonwealth; the need of supplementing the same and the methods of doing so and whether said methods should include the establishment of a state university, or further coöperation on the part of the Commonwealth with existing institutions, or otherwise. The commission shall report the result of its investigation to the General Court on or before the first Wednesday in February, 1923. The members of the commission shall serve without pay but may expend the sum of ten thousand dollars for expert and clerical assistance and otherwise as the governor and council may approve."

MINNESOTA. *Financial Suggestions*.—"There are three suggestions bearing in a general way upon our financial problems which, in barest outline, should be recorded.

"1. *Reduction of work*.—One method for removing the severe strain upon our financial resources would be to reduce the amount of work which the University is attempting. There are various forms

which this suggestion may take, any one or all of which may produce desirable results.

"(a) The activities in which the University now engages should be carefully scrutinized for the purpose of eliminating some projects. New courses and departments are being added to meet the new needs of the state as they arise. Possibly some of the earlier plans should be modified or abandoned. . .

"(b) Again, has not the time arrived for deciding definitely where secondary work ends and university work begins? At our present rate of growth, it is quite obvious that more adequate provision will have to be made by the state for the training of students in what is now regarded as the freshman and sophomore years. If junior colleges could be established in Minneapolis, St. Paul and Duluth, the situation would be wisely met for the present. We ought to look forward to the day when junior colleges will be established in various strategic centers throughout the state. . .

"(c) A further suggestion in the effort to set out clearly the outlines of a university would lead to the establishment of entirely new types of schools differentiated to meet the varying needs of students. Multitudes of boys and girls now come to the University because it is the best available place, and not because it provides just the type of training they need or want.

"2. *Increase the resources.*—Obviously, the other horn of the dilemma relates to the resources of the University. If the activities of the institution can be wisely curtailed its growth will largely counteract any relief which is thus found. . .

"The most natural method is to seek for increased legislative appropriations. . .

"3. *Emergency fund.*—The State of Minnesota should have an emergency fund, controlled by a state board, out of which allotments could be made to meet unexpected emergencies, which inevitably arise in the conduct of the state's business."

From the *President's Report, University of Minnesota.*

PURDUE UNIVERSITY. *Students of Exceptional Ability.*—"The faculty are impressed, as a result of their experience, with the fact that in this student body there are always some students of exceptional ability whose needs are not sufficiently served by the curriculum weighted to the average person. These exceptional students should

constitute the very flower of our product, but, under present circumstances, we are unable to provide for them a suitable outlet. While they are few in number, their potential achievements are very great. Our task is, first, to ascertain who they are, then to determine their own bent or need, and, lastly, to provide opportunity for them to study and develop according to their capacity.

"The discovery of these men is not usually possible before the senior year. Oftentimes the man does not know of his own ability. He needs the personal attention of advisors and instructors to direct him in a program which will stimulate, train and develop him. To do this and to provide these opportunities is, in my judgment, the most important thing the University can now do. We must continue indefinitely to receive large numbers of students and give them average training in accordance with their average capacity. This will largely absorb our energies and resources. The outstanding thing for the University to undertake is to develop the exceptional men from its student body."

*President's Report, 1921.*

OFFICERS OF CHAPTERS.—The following Chapters have reported recent election of officers:

Boston University, President, J. Geddes; Secretary, E. S. Brightman

University of Buffalo, President, Edward J. Moore; Secretary, Julian Park

Hamline University, President, Henry L. Osborn; Secretary, Arlon T. Adams

Iowa State College, President, Edward S. Allen; Secretary, John E. Evans

Mt. Holyoke College, President, Ellen C. Hinsdale; Secretary, Grace M. Bacon

Occidental College, President, J. C. Shedd; Secretary, Irene T. Myers

Pennsylvania State College, President, I. L. Foster; Secretary, J. Ben Hill

Whitman College, President, Louis F. Anderson; Secretary, Harlan S. Brode

Northwestern University, President, F. S. Philbrick; Secretary, C. L. Grose

## REPORT ON UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE OF INVESTIGATION INTO THE CASE OF THE DISMISSAL OF PROFESSOR GEORGE L. CLARK OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI.—On November 29, 1920, the following letter was sent to Professor George L. Clark of the Law School of the University of Missouri:

"I am instructed by the Board of Curators to inform you that your connection with the University will cease on September 1, 1921, and your membership in the Faculty and work as a teacher will terminate at the close of the present term.

"The Board feels forced to take this action because of your persistent and active disloyalty to the President, the lack of confidence on the part of students in your fairness, and your steadily declining usefulness to the institution as a result of these and other factors in your attitude and conduct.

Very truly yours,  
(Signed) LESLIE COWAN,  
*Secretary.*"

Professor Clark had been Professor of Law at the University of Missouri since 1913. This was the first notice received by Professor Clark and constituted a dismissal involving the termination of his work at the end of the winter term of 1920 but with a continuance of his salary until September 1, 1921. No hearing was given to Professor Clark up to the time the Board of Curators took the action indicated in this letter, which occurred on November 24, 1920. The Minutes of the Board Meeting of that date bearing upon this matter read as follows:

"Upon recommendation of the Dean of the Faculty of Law and the President, the following action was taken:

"That the Secretary of the Board notify Professor G. L. Clark that his connection with the University will cease September 1, 1921, and his services as a teacher and member of the Faculty end at the close of the present term."

Professor Clark after receipt of this notice of dismissal wrote to the Board of Curators on January 22 as follows:



"I acknowledge receipt of your letter of November 29, 1920, informing me that I had been dismissed from my professorship for (1) disloyalty to the President of the University; (2) lack of confidence by students in my fairness; (3) declining usefulness, as a professor, to the University. The order upon which your letter was based is a public record by R. S. Mo. '19, sec. 11544.

"I now remind you that I have had no opportunity to defend myself before you or any other tribunal, from the charges contained in your letter. I also remind you that it is contrary to the custom of American universities to discharge a professor, for causes alleged, without a hearing.

"Please regard this letter as a deliberate and sincere denial (1) that prior to November 29, I was disloyal to the President in the sense that I was disloyal to the University; (2) that before November 29, I was unfair as a professor or that any considerable number of students deemed me unfair; (3) that before November 29, my usefulness to the University had declined.

"In view of all the foregoing, I request that you rescind the order of dismissal referred to in your letter of November 29; and that you either (1) reinstate me as a professor of law, or else (2) substitute for the rescinded order another order having the effect of a temporary suspension together with a specification of charges similar to those in your letter of November 29, and the designation of a convenient time for a hearing on those charges."

At its meeting on February 3 and 4, the Board of Curators took the following action with regard to this request:

"A communication from George L. Clark, formerly a member of the Law Faculty, in which he requested that the previous action of the Board dismissing him from the professorship in law be reconsidered because there were not sufficient reasons for his dismissal, was considered. The Secretary was instructed to report to Mr. Clark that the Board declined to re-open the case."

There is presented in this case a clear instance of summary dismissal as all parties concerned have testified that no hearing was granted. There is no question of academic freedom involved in the sense in which the American Association of University Professors has defined that term. It would not seem to fall within the scope of action of Committee A of the American Association of University Professors, therefore, to examine into the truth or falsity or adequacy of the charges upon which Professor Clark was dismissed.

The fact of summary dismissal being established without controversy, the Committee might properly limit its report to a re-state-

ment of the position taken by the American Association of University Professors in opposition to any such action. It may, however, be of interest to inquire why a group of men, including the President of the University and the Board of Curators of such an institution as the University of Missouri, should feel warranted in taking action which on its face seems essentially unjust. It seemed that it might also be of interest to determine, if possible, what the attitude of the other administrative officers of the University of Missouri might be on that point, President Hill who was responsible for the dismissal of Professor Clark having severed his connection with the University of Missouri.<sup>1</sup>

With this in view, a letter was sent on September 13, 1921, to President Hill asking why no hearing had been given Professor Clark. President Hill had stated in letters to Secretary Tyler and to Professor Deibler of Committee A of the American Association of University Professors that there were "good reasons" for not according Professor Clark a hearing. Up to November 1, 1921, no reply to this inquiry had been received from President Hill.<sup>2</sup> With the same object in view, letters were written to the members of the Board of Curators of the University, both those who voted for the dismissal and those who were not present at the meeting, asking their views as to the propriety of dismissal without a hearing. President Hill, in one of the letters already referred to, stated that when he suggested a formal trial to the Board of Curators they absolutely refused to conduct one in Professor Clark's case. The Curators must therefore accept responsibility for the summary character of the dismissal. Of the members of the Board of Curators who voted to dismiss Professor Clark, only one replied.<sup>3</sup> This member stated that "a hearing would simply have added the element of delay to an action which had already been postponed too long. It would have also given to an insubordinate element a recognition to which I do not believe it would have

<sup>1</sup> Mention should be made of the fact that prior to the dismissal of Professor Clark a proposal for a judicial committee of the faculty, endorsed by the local chapter of the A. A. U. P. and approved by President Hill, had been voted down by the General Faculty of the University of Missouri.

<sup>2</sup> President Hill was out of the country at the time the letter was written and for some time afterwards but the Secretary of the Board of Curators had given assurance that the letter would be put in his hands as soon as he returned to Columbia.

<sup>3</sup> Appendix A.

been entitled." Letters were also sent to all present members of the Board of Curators, whether they were members at the time the action was taken in regard to Professor Clark or not. Only one or two replies were received and these seem to indicate that the feeling was general that a hearing would only have meant a delay which would have been injurious to the institution.

The only justification offered, therefore, by any member of the Board of Curators for the summary character of the action was that they were convinced that Professor Clark should be dismissed, that the sooner such action was taken the better, and that the only effect of a hearing would have been to delay a necessary step.

It is the opinion of the Committee of Investigation that such grounds are not proper grounds for denying the elemental justice of a hearing. From every quarter, there was conclusive evidence that no imputation of moral obliquity or turpitude in any way attached to Professor Clark's conduct. Under the most extreme views, therefore, the damage that could result to the University from such delay as might be involved in granting a hearing cannot be accepted as justification for their action.

The Board of Curators of the University of Missouri, therefore, by their past action and by such evidence as was obtainable of their present attitude, stand convicted of refusal to recognize the right for which the American Association of University Professors squarely stands, namely, that of a hearing before dismissal.<sup>1</sup>

The same inquiry was directed in personal interviews and by correspondence to the deans of the University of Missouri. The reason for following this line of inquiry was that shortly after the dismissal of Professor Clark, the deans of the various departments signed a statement to the effect that, in their opinion, the dismissal was amply justified. In that statement, no mention was made of the method of dismissal, but while the deans did not in their statement approve dismissal without a hearing, neither did they include in their statement any criticism of that feature. The direct question was asked of each of the deans who approved of the dismissal, whether

<sup>1</sup> The question of reopening the case was brought before the Board of Curators in November, 1921, and a special committee appointed to investigate the advisability of a reconsideration of this case, but this committee recommended that the matter should not be reopened, and the Board adopted this report. This closes the case except for the libel suit still pending.

he believed in the principle of a right to a hearing, and, if so, whether he believed the Clark case to constitute a proper exception to this principle, and why. Seven replies were received to this letter.<sup>1</sup>

Each one of the deans expressed himself as more or less completely in sympathy with the general principle of a hearing. The answer to the second question was less satisfactory. In conversation with the deans, only one expressed himself to the effect that he knew of no reason why an exception to the principle of a hearing should have been made in the case of Professor Clark.<sup>2</sup> In the written statements received, several indicated that they believed that exceptions to this principle must be recognized and that the Clark case constituted such an exception. This phase of the inquiry was undoubtedly complicated by the fact that Professor Clark, early in 1921, instituted a libel suit against President Hill and the members of the Law Faculty of the University of Missouri for publishing the following statement:

"It has come to our attention that Dr. George L. Clark, lately a professor of law in the University of Missouri school of law, but who was dismissed recently from his position, is claiming publicly throughout the state and elsewhere that his dismissal by the board of curators was improper and unjust. We, of the faculty of law of the University of Missouri, desire to state that in our opinion there were good and sufficient grounds for his dismissal. It is also our belief, based on facts known to us, that Dr. Clark, at the time this action was taken by the board of curators, had ceased to be a useful member of the faculty and in our opinion was not fitted to continue his associations with the school of law.

(Signed) J. P. McBAINE,  
J. L. PARKS,  
KENNETH C. SEARS,  
STANLEY H. UDY."

In connection with that suit, a large number of persons, including President Hill, all of the Law Faculty, and the deans, were put upon oath and made depositions at the instance of the legal representatives of Professor Clark. This libel suit, being still pending in the courts and the depositions being part of the testimony in the case, there

<sup>1</sup> Appendix "B." Dean Walter Williams of the School of Journalism was away on an extended trip when the letter was addressed to him but receipt was acknowledged by his secretary. Up to date no answer has been received from him.

<sup>2</sup> Dean Walter Miller of the Graduate School.



was a hesitancy, particularly on the part of the defendants in the suit, to comment in any way upon the issues involved. It appeared to them, or to some of them, impossible to give a justification of the summary character of the dismissal without entering into a discussion of matters, the truth or significance of which possibly constituted part of the questions involved in the libel suit. It seems clear, however, that any dean could have stated, had that been his opinion, that he believed the summary character of the dismissal was unjustified, without affecting his opinion or testimony regarding the propriety of the dismissal itself.

It remains a fact in any case, that only one of the administrative officers of the University definitely stated that he could not justify the summary feature of the dismissal, and while only one of the deans unequivocally stated that in his opinion the circumstances of the Clark case justified dismissal without hearing, it should be recorded as a fact that none of the other deans specifically repudiated the propriety of the summary feature.

Whether or not it would be possible for this Committee, or for the American Association of University Professors to declare that never, under any circumstances, should a summary dismissal take place, or whether or not it would be possible to indicate *a priori*, if the possibility of exception were admitted, what should be the nature of this exception, it is nevertheless the very strong conviction of your Committee that no such circumstances existed in the Clark case as to justify the lack of a hearing. It is the opinion of your Committee, therefore, that the failure of the deans to protest in any way against dismissal without hearing in this case, must lead to the conclusion that under similar circumstances a professor at the University of Missouri could not count on the support of the administrative officers for assurance of a hearing as a matter of justice.<sup>1</sup>

Although the only question within the official jurisdiction of the investigating committee is the matter of the procedure followed in the dismissal, your Committee feels that there are some aspects of the case of the dismissal of Professor Clark which are, or might be,

<sup>1</sup> It may not be out of place to record, purely as a matter of personal opinion of the Chairman of the Sub-Committee as a result of his trip to Columbia, that as a matter of *expediency* if not of justice, a hearing would be granted if a case of this sort should again arise at Missouri.

of great interest to the American Association of University Professors. This would seem to be especially true of the question raised by the enumerated charges in the letter of dismissal of Professor Clark, namely: "active and persistent disloyalty to the President." The Committee feels that by reason of the matter having been taken into Court by Professor Clark in a form which may involve the determination of the existence of just ground for dismissal, it would be inexpedient for the Association to try these issues itself. But it might be worth while, should another case arise in which this question of loyalty or opposition to the president is raised in a form in which the Association of American University Professors can take it up, to attempt a formulation of the questions of the rights and duties of members of the faculty in this regard, and of their relation with the president and other administrative officers of the university. Much interesting evidence of various attitudes towards this point exists in the depositions made in the libel suit brought by Professor Clark, but for the reasons stated before is not to be used by your Committee as a basis for a declaration of general principles such as the Association has attempted with regard to academic freedom. But it seems to your Committee that it should be a matter of as much interest to the Association to safeguard the right of a professor to criticize acts of the administrative officers of the University as to safeguard the rights of a member to criticize the social, economic, or political order under which he lives as a citizen.

Respectfully submitted:

H. G. JAMES, *Chairman,*

F. E. KESTER,

J. P. LICHTENBERGER,

W. A. OLDFATHER,

H. S. WHITE.

On behalf of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure I have examined the report of the Committee on Inquiry on the University of Missouri and find it to be in accordance with the procedure approved by the General Committee; and as Acting Chairman of the Committee I authorize its publication. The Committee of Inquiry alone is responsible for its findings of facts.

F. S. DEIBLER, *Chairman, Committee A, at the time of the investigation.*

## APPENDIX A

Paris, Mo., Sept. 19, 1921.

Mr. H. G. James,  
Austin, Texas.

Dear Mr. James:

Replying to your letter of September 13 in regard to Professor Clark, I will state that the Board of Curators voted to dismiss him from the Missouri University faculty after becoming satisfied that it had sufficient facts to justify such action. Statements from the dean of his department and from deans of other departments were of such a nature that the Board was fully convinced that the best interests of the institution demanded the elimination of Professor Clark.

To have given him a hearing would simply have added the element of delay to an action that had already been postponed too long. It also would have given to an insubordinate element a recognition to which I believe it was not entitled. I think I voice the sentiment of the entire Board when I say the dismissal of Prof. Clark was the beginning of better things in our University. It was one way the Board had of expressing its loyalty to the administration it had installed and its conviction that faculty members who were not willing to give loyal coöperation should be displaced in favor of those who would.

I would suggest that you write to the dean of the Law Department at Columbia for any further facts you may desire about Prof. Clark's disloyalty or the propriety of the Board's action.

Yours truly,

(Signed) H. J. BLANTON,  
*Member of Board of Curators.*

## APPENDIX B

University of Missouri  
Columbia, Mo.

Graduate School

Nov. 16, 1921.

Professor H. G. James,  
University of Texas,  
Austin, Texas.

My dear Professor James:

You are probably thinking that I promptly forgot my promise to write to you without a reminder after your visit to Columbia. I beg to assure you that our interview has not passed from my memory.

After your departure, I at once took up with Acting President Jones the desirability of the deans sending you a common statement in regard to the dismissal of Professor George L. Clark. This we expected to do but as the matter

has been delayed for some time and as I have learned that others have written individual letters, I beg leave to submit to you in writing the following statement that I made to you orally:

I believe firmly in the principle adopted by the Association that no teacher of professorial rank should be dismissed without a hearing. It is possible that instances may arise where dismissal without a hearing may be proper. I know of no cogent reason why a hearing should not have been granted Professor Clark.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) WALTER MILLER, *Dean.*

Sept. 27, 1921.

Dr. Herman G. James,  
Austin, Texas.

My dear Dr. James:

In our conference in Columbia in regard to the case of Professor George L. Clark, you requested my opinion on the following questions:

- (1) Should a University teacher be dismissed without a hearing?
- (2) Was the dismissal of Professor George L. Clark without a hearing justified under the circumstances?

In reply to the first question, permit me to say that I am of the opinion that teachers should not be dismissed without a hearing, except in extraordinary cases. In view of the circumstances surrounding the case of Professor George L. Clark, as set forth in the depositions of President A. Ross Hill, of the teachers in the School of Law and of the Deans of the various Divisions of the University, I am of the opinion that the action of the Board of Curators in this case was justified.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) J. C. JONES,  
*Acting President.*

Oct. 7, 1921.

Professor Herman G. James,  
University of Texas,  
Austin, Texas.

Dear Professor James:

In answer to your letter of September 27, I regret that I did not have an opportunity to meet you while you were in Columbia.

I am aware of the stand of the Association on the matter of summary dismissal without a hearing and am thoroughly in sympathy with its point of view. Quite often, however, there are exceptional cases that appear to justify a deviation from general principles of procedure however important such principles may be. These exceptions are based on emergency conditions and forms of dereliction which may demand immediate dismissal.



I regret that the Association did not take this matter up at once before Mr. Clark appealed to the courts and I was called upon to give testimony under oath and under the rules of court procedure. However, since I was called and made my sworn statement and submitted to cross-examination by Mr. Clark's attorneys, I feel that I should have nothing further to say with reference to this case. A stenographic record was taken of my testimony at the hearing, and I have no doubt this record is available to any representative of the Association. I have no transcript of my testimony at hand and do not care to make any other statement. Since the case was taken into court and testimony under oath is now of record, the Association might find a review of that testimony of some value in helping to reach a final decision as to the real merits of the case.

I feel that in speaking informally to a representative of the Association or in writing I might easily allow my feelings to color my statements; but I believe my statements on the witness stand are more free from bias and should be taken as representing a considered judgment. I do not hesitate to say, however, that after many months have passed and after hearing the testimony of others in court and elsewhere, I am more than ever convinced that the University authorities were fully justified in their action in the case of Mr. Clark, and that the best interests of the University would have been served had such action been taken earlier.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) E. J. McCAUSTLAND,  
*Dean, School of Engineering.*

October 6, 1921.

Professor Herman James,  
University of Texas,  
Austin, Texas.

My dear Professor James:

Replying to your questions as to (1) my opinion as to the manner of dismissal of university professors, and (2) the dismissal of G. L. Clark by the Board of Curators of the University of Missouri, I have the following to say:

I. I am of the opinion that as a general rule there should be a hearing before dismissal, though I also am of the opinion that special cases may exist in which dismissal without a hearing is just.

II. In view of the fact that Mr. Clark has law suits pending in the Missouri Court against the former president of the University, two members of the law faculty, a former member of the law faculty, and myself, I am unwilling to discuss his dismissal.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) J. P. McBAINE,  
*Dean, School of Law.*

October 4, 1921.

Prof. Herman G. James,  
Department of Government,  
University of Texas,  
Austin, Texas.

My dear Professor James:

This is to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of September 27th. I regret not having had the pleasure of seeing you at the time of your recent visit to Columbia.

If a statement of my attitude toward the matter referred to in your letter can be of any possible assistance in connection with the inquiry which is now being carried on by the Association of American University Professors, I am very glad to submit the following statement to you.

I am in sympathy with the general principle of giving a person a hearing before dismissal from any institution but I can conceive it to be possible for an individual to so conduct himself as to forfeit the right to any such consideration.

If it came to my knowledge that the governing board of any of the State Universities with which I happen to be familiar had deliberately determined to dismiss a teacher without hearing, my inclination would be to accept the judgment of such a governing board without discussion.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) GUY L. NOYES,  
Dean, School of Medicine.

Sept. 29, 1921.

Dr. Herman G. James,  
Department of Government,  
University of Texas,  
Austin, Texas.

My dear Doctor James:

Replying to your letter of September 27, I have no comments to make on the case of Professor Clark, who was dismissed from the University of Missouri by the Board of Curators, except to say that, so far as I have been able to learn, his dismissal was abundantly justified.

It is my personal opinion that as a general rule men of professorial rank are entitled to a hearing. I am not so sure that they are in every case entitled to a formal hearing before the Board of Control. If a man has been definitely charged by an administrative officer with neglect of duty or inefficiency or other acts which interfere with his usefulness as a teacher, and he has been given a chance to be heard in his own behalf, such an opportunity should under some circumstances be regarded as a hearing.

I can conceive of conditions where summary dismissal without a hearing before the Board of Control or administrative officers would be justified.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) F. B. MUMFORD,  
*Dean and Director, School of Agriculture.*

Sept. 26, 1921.

Professor H. G. James,  
University of Texas,  
Austin, Texas.

My dear Professor James:

In reply to your inquiry I will state that in my opinion a professor who holds a position for an indefinite period in a college or university should not be dismissed without a hearing.

I recognize, however, that extraordinary cases may arise when it would not be desirable nor essential that such a hearing should be given. As indicated to you, I have had some doubt as to whether the Clark case fell under this class of extraordinary cases. In view of all the circumstances, however, I am not prepared to say that its inclusion under that class was not justified.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) ISIDOR LOEB,  
*Dean, School of Business and Public Administration.*

## MEMBERSHIP

### MEMBERS ELECTED

The Committee on Admissions announces the election of eighty-eight members, as follows:

**University of Buffalo**, W. G. Gregory; **University of California** (Los Angeles), J. M. Adams, M. L. Darsie, F. J. Flingberg, C. E. Martin, G. E. F. Sherwood, H. M. Showman, W. A. Smith; **Centre College**, F. L. Rainey; **University of Chattanooga**, F. F. Hooper; **Columbia University**, R. M. Haig; **Connecticut College**, Susan K. Noel; **Dartmouth College**, Howard D. Dozier; **Denison University**, F. G. Detweiler, S. I. Kornhauser, T. A. Lewis, August Odebrecht; **University of Denver**, E. B. Renaud; **Franklin College**, H. N. Sherwood; **Goucher College**, H. T. Baker, C. S. Ball, W. A. Beardsley, J. M. Beatty, Gertrude C. Bussey, Esther J. Crooks, E. N. Curtis, R. P. Dougherty, Katharine J. Gallagher, R. P. Hawes, Annette B. Hopkins, Jessie L. King, E. P. Kuhl, C. W. Lemmi, Florence P. Lewis, Ella Lonn, Stella A. McCarty, Anna I. Miller, Elizabeth Nitchie, Agnes L. Rogers, Dorothy Stimson; **University of Illinois**, R. M. Story; **Indiana University**, Flora C. Anderson, Edith C. Williams; **Iowa State College**, J. W. Woodrow; **Hiram College**, R. H. Goodale, J. E. Smith; **University of Louisville**, W. B. Belknap, M. A. Caldwell, R. S. Cotterill, N. J. Ware; **University of Nebraska**, Ernest Anderson, T. J. Thompson; **Ohio Wesleyan University**, J. H. Collord, C. H. Skinner, R. H. Walker; **University of Oregon**, S. B. Warner; **Pennsylvania State College**, M. M. Harris, J. O. Keller; **University of Pittsburgh**, J. C. Donaldson; **Purdue University**, G. C. Blalock; **Reed College**, Charles McKinley, E. O. Sisson; **Rose Polytechnic Institute**, C. C. Knipmeyer, John White, Carl Wischmeyer; **Rutgers College**, W. J. Crozier, George Winchester; **Simmons College**, H. L. Harley; **University of South Dakota**, A. M. Pardee; **University of Wisconsin**, G. H. Stuart, C. D. Zdanowicz; **Worcester Polytechnic Institute**, D. F. Calhane, A. W. French, G. H. Haynes, H. C. Ives, W. L. Jennings, Arthur J. Knight, J. O. Phelon, S. J. Plimpton, C. A. Read, F. W. Roys, A. L. Smith, J. B. Zinn; **Yale University**, G. S. Counts, R. J. Menner, G. H. Nettleton, G. H. Smith, E. L. Troxell.



## NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following ninety-five nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions<sup>1</sup> and will be considered by the Committee if received before September 1, 1922.

The Committee on Admissions consist of Florence Bascom (Bryn Mawr), Chairman, J. Q. Dealey (Brown), A. R. Hohlfeld (Wisconsin), A. L. Keith (South Dakota), G. H. Marx (Stanford), and F. C. Woodward (Chicago).

Henry B. Aikin (Civil Engineering), Tennessee  
H. H. Atkinson (English), Iowa (College)  
Fred W. Bentley (Drawing), North Dakota  
Marguerite Billard (French), Mills  
Alfred Boyd (Civil Engineering), North Dakota  
Albert Eger Brown (Military Science), North Dakota  
W. E. Budge (Mines), North Dakota  
W. R. Burwell (Mathematics), Tennessee  
Willis A. Chamberlin (Modern Languages), Denison  
John Preston Comer (Political Science), Southern Methodist  
Harry H. Coxen (Education), Tennessee  
Rufus Crane (Engineering), Ohio Wesleyan  
N. W. Daugherty (Engineering), Tennessee  
Frederick N. Duncan (Biology), Southern Methodist  
O. W. Dynes (Agronomy), Tennessee  
Arthur Roy Fehn (Mathematics), Wyoming  
Kemper Fullerton (Theology), Oberlin  
A. H. Forman (English), West Virginia  
O. C. Gebert (Modern Languages), Wyoming  
Philo F. Hammond (Physics), Wyoming  
K. P. Harrington (Latin), Wesleyan  
John C. Hessler (Chemistry), Knox  
William L. Holt (Hygiene), Tennessee  
W. W. Hooper (Philosophy and Education), Chattanooga  
W. C. Huntington (Civil Engineering), Colorado

<sup>1</sup> Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, 222 Charles River Road, Cambridge, Mass.

Harriet Dale Johnson (Latin), Denison  
Arthur W. Locke (Music), Smith  
William S. Lohr (Civil Engineering), Lafayette  
Helen I. Loveland (English), Morningside  
R. B. Lowry (Agronomy), Tennessee  
Robert Clayton Matthews (Engineering), Tennessee  
John S. McIntosh (Latin), Southern Methodist  
H. E. McMinn (Botany), Mills  
Edgar A. Menk (Classical Languages), North Dakota  
F. A. Middlebush (History and Government), Knox  
Dexter Perkins (History and Government), Rochester  
Henry J. Peterson (Political Science), Iowa (University)  
Robert S. Radford (Latin), Tennessee  
Josephine Reddish (Mathematics), Tennessee  
Hyder E. Rollins (English), New York  
Harold W. Shoenberger (English), Pennsylvania State  
Frederick W. Slantz (Graphics), Lafayette  
Bunyan Spencer (Philosophy), Denison  
H. P. Stemple (Economics), Ohio Wesleyan  
W. C. Stiles (Animal Husbandry), Tennessee  
John A. Switzer (Engineering), Tennessee  
William H. Walton (Pathology), Boston University  
Samuel M. Waxman (Romance Languages), Boston University  
Edwin O. Weaver (Physics), Wittenberg  
Ralph S. Wilbur (Mechanical Engineering), Lafayette  
E. H. Wilcox (Music), North Dakota  
John E. Winter (Philosophy), West Virginia  
A. E. Wood (Sociology), Michigan  
W. R. Woolrich (Engineering), Tennessee  
C. Elmer Wylie (Dairying), Tennessee

*Supplementary List*

Homer Burton Adkins (Chemistry), Wisconsin  
John Edward Anderson (Psychology), Yale  
John O. Beaty (English), Southern Methodist  
George Boas (Philosophy), Johns Hopkins  
Alice F. Braunlich (Latin), Goucher  
J. P. Buck (Agriculture), Tennessee

Charles Bell Burke (English), Tennessee  
 Walter G. Cady (Physics), Wesleyan  
 Harold Chidsey (Philosophy), Union  
 Ralph E. Cleland (Biology), Goucher  
 C. H. Conley (English), Wesleyan  
 Herbert E. Cory (Philosophy), Johns Hopkins  
 Paul E. Cox (Ceramic Engineering), Iowa State  
 Edward E. Curtis (History), Wellesley  
 P. H. Douglas (Commerce), Chicago  
 Donald B. Durham (Latin and Greek), Hamilton  
 Clyde Eagleton (History), Southern Methodist  
 Edward Fitch (Greek), Hamilton  
 Paul W. Graff (Botany), Montana  
 John E. Guberlet (Zoology), Oklahoma Agricultural  
 Carl Emil Hanson (Mechanical Engineering), Iowa State  
 Hélène Harvitt (Romance Languages), Columbia  
 Charles R. Hoover (Chemistry), Wesleyan  
 Jay B. Hubbell (English), Southern Methodist  
 Joseph D. Ibbotson (Librarian), Hamilton  
 Theodore Sedgwick Johnson (Civil Engineering), Denison  
 William Heard Kilpatrick (Education), Columbia  
 Wencel J. Kostir (Zoology), Columbia  
 Alma de L. LeDuc (Romance Languages), Columbia  
 Calvin L. Lewis (English), Hamilton  
 Aldo C. Massaglia (Pathology), North Dakota  
 Albro D. Morrill (Biology), Hamilton  
 William Chas. Morro (Biblical History), Butler  
 Herbert J. Plagge (Physics), Iowa State  
 William Fielding Ogburn (Sociology), Columbia  
 James P. C. Southall (Physics), Columbia  
 Charles W. Waddle (Education), California (Los Angeles)  
 Agnes R. Wayman (Physical Education), Columbia  
 Ernest Hunter Wright (English), Columbia  
 Hessel E. Yutema (Public Law), Columbia

## MEMBERSHIP CORRECTION AND ADDITIONS

M. C. Elmer	University of Minnesota
Jules T. Frelin	University of Minnesota

O. M. Johnston	Stanford University
A. R. Seymour	University of Illinois
E. D. Starbuck	Iowa State University

*Transfers and Changes of Address*

S. R. Ashby	Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
G. C. Bassett	Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Eliot Blackwelder	Stanford University, Stanford, Cal.
Alzada Comstock	Barnard College, New York
W. W. Cook	Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
D. H. Dolley	St. Louis University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Mo.
J. L. Erb	22 Pierrepont St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Georgia E. Finlay	5478 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. W. Goodhue	Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
W. K. Green	Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Etta H. Handy	Stanford University, Stanford, Cal.
R. H. Jordan	121 Goldwin Smith Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
F. W. Luehring	University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
E. L. Mudge	Methodist Book Concern, 420 Plum St., Cincinnati, Ohio
W. W. Palmer	Presbyterian Hospital, 41 E. 70th St., New York City
R. W. Sellars	64 Keene St., Providence, R. I.
E. H. Sturtevant	28 Myrtle Ave., Edgewater, N. J.
Mary Yost	Dean of Women, Stanford University, Stanford, Cal.

*Members Deceased*

H. A. Peck	Honorary Member, Syracuse University.
Williston Walker	Yale University